

Mr. GRONNA. There are some publications that touch on this particular question; but there is not, at least I have not been able to find one, any document that will give full information regarding this question. I believe the subject is of sufficient importance to expend \$30,000 to get the information. The joint resolution simply provides for the appointment of a commission to get facts. The farming communities of this country are certainly entitled to that much.

Mr. BACON. I want the farmers to have it, but I do not want to go to any unnecessary expense to get it. I think it can be found in books already in existence which are available, and if not the information can all be gotten through United States consuls without any additional expense.

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to ask a question. Could not all the information the Senator desires to get be secured through our consular agencies?

Mr. GRONNA. I have not been able to get such information.

Mr. CURTIS. Has the Senator tried?

Mr. GRONNA. Yes.

Mr. CURTIS. And they refused to give it to him?

Mr. GRONNA. Refused to give it? Oh, no; not at all. I say I have been unable to find any document that will give the desired information regarding this question. It is no small question.

Mr. CURTIS. I fully realize it is no small question, but I do realize that all over the world we have consular agents who, if properly applied to, would furnish all the information desired on this question.

I remember also that some years ago when the financial question was agitating the people of the country there were plenty of documents printed, giving the plans followed in France and every other plan you could think of. I think with a few hours digging in the library for the period covering the years 1893, 1894, 1895, 1896, and 1897 one could find all the information desired on this subject. Probably by going to the Monetary Commission one could get a lot of it.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, I should like to call attention to the fact that these are corporations, and their terms or conditions of association are published facts, and their annual reports, or reports made even more frequently than that, give all the information in regard to these loans and the rates of interest. Then there is, I think, in the possession of some Senators here, at least I have had in my possession, and I think I could put my hands on it without much delay, a complete discussion of this question sent out by those who are advocating it. But being corporations, you can get the official statements. There is no trouble about that.

Mr. GRONNA. It is true there are publications. I have in my hand one, printed in Rome, giving information about rural banks and rural credit unions; but I do say there is no complete information showing the benefits to be derived, not only financially, but socially, from a thorough system of cooperative unions.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. CURTIS. What is the motion?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion is to strike out "thirty" and insert "twenty," so as to read "\$20,000." [Putting the question.] The "noes" appear to have it.

Mr. OVERMAN. I call for a division.

Mr. GALLINGER. It is manifest a quorum could not be secured this evening, and I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, April 19, 1912, at 2 o'clock p. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, April 18, 1912.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our heavenly Father, help us over the rough places as we journey through this day, that with unselfish devotion to duty and the rectitude of our behavior we may find ourselves at its close a little nearer heaven. In the spirit of the Lord Jesus Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

LIFEBOATS FOR PASSENGER VESSELS.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is in possession of a telegram which he is not certain whether it should be laid before the House or go through the basket, but he will lay it before the House.

The Clerk read as follows:

NEW YORK, April 17, 1912.

The honorable CHAMP CLARK,

Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

We unite in urging speedy enactment of well-considered statute that will effectually require every passenger vessel leaving a United States port to be equipped with such lifeboats or rafts as shall suffice to receive and float every human creature on board.

Mayor James B. McEwan, Albany; Mayor Clarence E. Caruth, Cohoes; Mayor Lynn R. Lewis, Cowland; Mayor J. J. Bolan, Fulton; Mayor Reuben R. Gulvin, Geneva; Mayor John Irving, Binghamton; Mayor Frederick A. Ellison, Corning; Mayor Daniel Sheehan, Elmira; Mayor W. Irving Griffing, Glens Falls; Mayor Alden L. Henry, Gloversville; Mayor Louis Van Hoesen, Hudson; Mayor Samuel A. Carlson, Jamestown; Mayor Robert H. Reed, Lackawanna; Mayor James J. Moran, Lockport; Mayor E. W. Fiske, Mount Vernon; Mayor F. H. Waldorf, New Rochelle; Mayor George E. Van Kannon, Ogdensburg; Mayor F. D. Blodgett, Oneonta; Mayor W. H. Nearpass, Port Jervis; Mayor Thomas Penney, Rensselaer; Mayor Stewart E. Townsend, Rome; Charles Zuckmaler, Tonawanda; E. J. Henratta, Watervliet; John Reamer, Ithaca; Mayor Abram Harrison, Johnstown; Mayor Frank H. Small, Little Falls; Mayor Rosslyn M. Cox, Middletown; Mayor J. B. Corwin, Newburgh; Mayor Louis Fick, North Tonawanda; Mayor Peter C. Foley, Olean; Mayor David D. Long, Oswego; Mayor John K. Sague, Poughkeepsie; Mayor Hiram H. Edgerton, Rochester; Mayor Dr. George R. Lunn, Schenectady; Mayor Frank J. Baker, Utica; Francis Hugo, Watertown; James T. Lennon, Yonkers.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands that a similar telegram was sent to Vice President SHERMAN.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, in that connection I want to say that I introduced a bill yesterday to accomplish that very purpose.

The SPEAKER. The telegram will be referred to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. CRAVENS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 21821. An act to authorize the city of South Sioux City, in the State of Nebraska, to construct a bridge across the Missouri River between the States of Nebraska and Iowa.

EMPLOYMENT AND COMPENSATION OF MRS. HELEN GREY.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for two minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to address the House for two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I notice from the RECORD of Tuesday last that in the colloquy between Mr. MANN, of Illinois, and his colleague, Mr. GRAHAM, reference was made to me in connection with the employment of Mrs. Helen Grey.

In order that there may be no misunderstanding as far as I am concerned, I wish to say that the Democratic congressional committee has two persons employed to do research work and to gather statistical and other information for Members and committees. These persons are Josiah Shinn and Mrs. Helen Grey.

Mr. Shinn has been employed for about four years in this work and has received compensation at the rate of \$150 per month, excepting during the time he was in the employ of the House, when his service was rendered without compensation.

Mrs. Grey was employed less than a year ago and has received a salary of \$75 per month. She has spent much time in gathering information for the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department, of which Mr. GRAHAM, of Illinois, is chairman.

Neither Mr. Shinn nor Mrs. Grey has received any money from me, or from any other source so far as I have knowledge, excepting that which has been paid them by the Democratic congressional committee.

AMERICAN NATIONAL RED CROSS.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the bill (H. R. 16306) to provide for the use of the American National Red Cross in aid of the land and naval forces in time of actual or threatened war, with a Senate amendment thereto.

The Senate amendment was read.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, I move to concur in the Senate amendment. The only change in the House bill made by the Senate was to strike out the preamble in the House bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York to concur in the Senate amendment.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, I request that the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill (H. R. 19212), with the Senate amendments duly numbered, be printed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill, with the Senate amendments, be printed. Is there objection?

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, has the gentleman not the right to have this printed without unanimous consent?

Mr. SULZER. Certainly. I did not ask unanimous consent.

Mr. GARNER. Then, why ask unanimous consent?

Mr. SULZER. The Chair misunderstood me. I did not ask unanimous consent; I merely requested to have it done.

Mr. GARNER. It is not necessary to ask the House to have it done.

Mr. SULZER. I thought so; but the clerk was in doubt about it.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Texas that the bill has not been referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. If it had been referred to the committee, then the gentleman from Texas would be right.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it has always been customary to have these appropriation bills printed when they were taken from the Speaker's table, the Senate amendments disagreed to, and the conference agreed to. The bill was then printed with the Senate amendments numbered.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, that was my understanding of the practice of the House, but the clerk of the committee informs me that he would like to have this request made, as there is some doubt whether he had the right to do the printing. I think he has the right.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I shall make no objection; but if the practice of the past was without warrant of rule, then the rules ought to be changed so as to give the warrant for the printing of appropriation bills with Senate amendments, although they have not been referred to the committee of the House.

Mr. SULZER. I agree with the gentleman from Illinois.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is inclined to agree with the gentleman from Illinois, as a matter of practice, and it will be done hereafter, without any further order or ceremony. The Chair thinks the practice that the gentleman suggests is correct.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 14083) to create a new division of the southern judicial district of Texas, and to provide for terms of court at Corpus Christi, Tex., and for a clerk for said court, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had agreed to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. CLARK of Wyoming, Mr. NELSON, and Mr. CULBERSON as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Secretary be directed to request the House of Representatives to return to the Senate the bill (S. 5333) to authorize the widening and extension of Spring Road NW., and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested.

S. 4552. An act for the relief of the estate of Benjamin B. Cox, and others.

SENATE BILL REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below:

S. 4552. An act for the relief of the estate of Benjamin B. Cox, and others; to the Committee on Claims.

POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following privileged resolution, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Committee on Rules, to whom was referred the resolution (H. Res. 444) to change the rules of the House temporarily for the consideration of H. R. 21279, have considered the same and report the following substitute with the recommendation that it be adopted (H. Rept. 570):

Resolved, That after the adoption of this rule it shall be in order in the consideration of H. R. 21279, a bill making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, and for other purposes, to consider the new legislation on said bill hereinafter mentioned notwithstanding the general rules of the House.

First. On pages 18 and 19 the following proviso:

Provided further, That after the 1st of July, 1917, the Postmaster General shall not approve or allow to be used or pay for any full railway post office car not constructed of steel, steel underframe, or equally indestructible material, and not less than 20 per cent of the new equipment shall be put into operation annually after July, 1912; and after the passage of this act no contract shall be entered into for the construction of steel-underframe cars."

Second. In the order in which the sections come in said bill, sections 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12 shall be in order as follows:

"Sec. 2. No contract for furnishing supplies to the Post Office Department or the postal service shall be made with any person who has entered, or proposed to enter, into any combination to prevent the making of any bid for furnishing such supplies, or to fix a price or prices therefor, or who has made any agreement, or given or performed, or promised to give or perform any consideration whatever to induce any other person not to bid for any such contract, or to bid at a specified price or prices thereon; and if any person so offending is a contractor for furnishing such supplies, his contract may be annulled, and the person so offending shall be liable to a fine of not less than \$100 nor more than \$5,000, and may be further punished, in the discretion of the court, by imprisonment for not less than three months nor more than one year.

"BONDS OF NAVY MAIL CLERKS.

"Sec. 3. That every Navy mail clerk and assistant Navy mail clerk shall give bond to the United States in such penal sum as the Postmaster General may deem sufficient for the faithful performance of his duties as such clerk.

"Sec. 4. When, after a weighing of the mails for the purpose of readjusting the compensation for their transportation on a railroad route, mails are diverted therefrom or thereto, the Postmaster General may, in his discretion, ascertain the effect of such diversion by a weighing of such mails for such number of successive working days as he may determine, and have the weights stated and verified to him as in other cases, and readjust the compensation on the routes affected accordingly: *Provided*, That no readjustment shall be made unless the diverted mails equal at least 10 per cent of the average daily weight on any of the routes affected.

"Sec. 5. That on and after July 1 next following the passage of this act letter carriers in the City Delivery Service and clerks in first and second class post offices shall be required to work not more than eight hours a day: *Provided*, That the eight hours of service shall not extend over a longer period than 10 consecutive hours, and the schedules of duty of the employees shall be regulated accordingly.

"That in cases of emergency, or if the needs of the service require, letter carriers in the City Delivery Service and clerks in first and second class post offices can be required to work in excess of eight hours a day, and for such additional services they shall be paid extra in proportion to their salaries as fixed by law.

"That should the needs of the service require the employment on Sunday of letter carriers in the City Delivery Service and clerks in first and second class post offices, the employees who are required and ordered to perform Sunday work shall be allowed compensatory time on one of the six days following the Sunday on which they perform such service.

"Sec. 6. That no person in the classified civil service of the United States employed in the postal service shall be removed therefrom except for such cause as will promote the efficiency of said service and for reasons given in writing, and the person whose removal is sought shall have notice of the same and of any charges preferred against him, and be furnished with a copy thereof, and also be allowed a reasonable time for personally answering the same in writing; and affidavits in support thereof; but no examination of witnesses nor any trial or hearing shall be required except in the discretion of the officer making the removal; and copies of charges, notice of hearings, answer, reasons for removal, and of the order of removal shall be made a part of the records of the proper department or office, as shall also the reasons for reduction in rank or compensation; and copies of the same shall be annually reported to Congress and furnished to the person affected upon request, and the Civil Service Commission also shall, upon request, be furnished copies of the same or the originals thereof: *Provided, however*, That membership in any society, association, club, or other form of organization of postal employees having for its objects, among other things, improvements in the condition of labor of its members, including hours of labor and compensation therefor and leave of absence, by any person or groups of persons in said postal service, or the presenting by any such person or groups of persons of any grievance or grievances to the Congress or any Member thereof shall not constitute or be cause for reduction in rank or compensation or removal of such person or groups of persons from said service.

"Sec. 7. That after June 30, 1912, the Postmaster General may appoint railway postal clerks in such manner and of such respective grades and salaries as may be provided for in the annual appropriation acts for the service of the Post Office Department, for the purpose of sorting and distributing the mail in railway post offices, railway post-office terminals, and transfer offices, and for service in the offices of division superintendents and chief clerks, and as transfer clerks and such other services as may pertain to the Railway Mail Service. Such clerks shall be designated as railway postal clerks and shall be divided into the following grades, with corresponding salaries per annum not exceeding the following rates:

"Grade 1, at not exceeding \$900.

"Grade 2, at not exceeding \$1,000.

"Grade 3, at not exceeding \$1,100.

"Grade 4, at not exceeding \$1,200.

"Grade 5, at not exceeding \$1,300.

"Grade 6, at not exceeding \$1,400.

"Grade 7, at not exceeding \$1,500.

"Grade 8, at not exceeding \$1,600.

"Grade 9, at not exceeding \$1,700.

"Grade 10, at not exceeding \$1,800.

"Chief clerks, at not exceeding \$2,000.

"The Postmaster General shall classify and fix the salaries of railway postal clerks, under such regulations as he may prescribe, in the grades provided by law; and for the purpose of organization and of establishing maximum grades to which promotions may be made successively as hereinafter provided, he shall classify railway post offices, terminal railway post offices, and transfer offices with reference to their character and importance in three classes, with salary grades as follows: Class A, \$900 to \$1,200; class B, \$900 to \$1,300; and class C, \$900 to \$1,500. He may assign to the offices of division superintendents and chief clerks such railway postal clerks as may be necessary and fix their salaries within the grades provided by law without regard to the classification of railway post offices.

"After June 30, 1913, clerks in class A shall be promoted successively to grade 3, clerks in class B shall be promoted successively to grade 4, and clerks in class C shall be promoted successively to grade 5 at the beginning of the quarter following the expiration of a year's satisfactory service in the next lower grade. Promotions above these grades within the maximum grades of the classification may be made in the discretion of the Postmaster General for meritorious service. No promotion shall be made except upon evidence satisfactory to the Post

Office Department of the efficiency and faithfulness of the employee during the preceding year.

"A clerk of any grade of any classification of railway post offices, terminal railway post offices, transfer offices, or in the office of a division superintendent or chief clerk may be transferred and assigned to any classification of railway post offices, terminal railway post offices, transfer offices, or to an office of a division superintendent or chief clerk under such regulations as the Postmaster General may deem proper.

"Clerks assigned as clerks in charge of crews consisting of more than one clerk shall be clerks of grades 5 to 10, inclusive, and may be promoted one grade only after three years' continuous, satisfactory, and faithful service in such capacity.

"A clerk who fails of promotion because of unsatisfactory service may be promoted at the beginning of the second quarter thereafter or any subsequent quarter for satisfactory and faithful service during the intervening period.

"Clerks in the highest grade in their respective lines or other assignments shall be eligible for promotion to positions of clerks in charge in said lines or corresponding positions in other assignments, and clerks assigned as assistant chief clerks and clerks in charge of crews consisting of more than one clerk, either assigned to the line, the transfer service, or to a terminal railway post office, and clerks in the highest grades in offices of division superintendents in their respective divisions shall, after two years of continuous service in such capacity, be eligible for promotion to positions of chief clerks in said division for satisfactory, efficient, and faithful service during the preceding two-year period under such regulations as the Postmaster General shall prescribe.

"Whenever a clerk shall have been reduced in salary for any cause he may be restored to his former grade or advanced to an intermediate grade at the beginning of any quarter following the reduction for satisfactory and faithful service during the intervening period.

"In filling positions below that of chief clerk no clerk shall be advanced more than one grade in a period of a year.

"All clerks appointed to the Railway Mail Service and to perform duty on railway post offices shall reside at some point on the route to which they are assigned; but railway postal clerks appointed prior to February 28, 1895, and now performing such duty shall not be required to change their residences, except when transferred to another line: *Provided, however*, that because of the reclassification herein provided no clerk shall receive less salary than before the passage of this act. All laws and parts of laws in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

"Sec. 8. That hereafter postage shall be paid on matter of the fourth class at the rate of 12 cents per pound, except as herein provided.

"That no article, package, or parcel shall be mailable as matter of the fourth class which exceeds 11 pounds in weight, except as herein provided.

"That on each and all rural mail-delivery routes of the United States the postmaster at the starting point of such route shall, until June 30, 1914, receive and deliver to the carrier or carriers of said routes all articles, parcels, or packages not prohibited to the mails by law and falling under the definition of fourth-class matter and not weighing in excess of 11 pounds for transportation and delivery on said routes only; and the carriers shall receive at intermediate points on all rural routes such mail matter of the fourth class for delivery on their respective routes only.

"That postage shall be paid on all articles, parcels, or packages entitled to transportation under the provisions of this act as matter of the fourth class on rural mail-delivery routes only at the following rates: One cent for each 2 ounces or less, 2 cents for more than 2 ounces but not more than 4 ounces, 3 cents for more than 4 ounces but not more than 8 ounces, 4 cents for more than 8 ounces but not more than 12 ounces, 5 cents for more than 12 ounces but not more than a pound, and 2 cents per pound for each additional pound or fraction thereof up to and including a total of 11 pounds. That the Postmaster General shall make all rules and regulations necessary and not inconsistent with law to the proper execution of this act.

"That for the purpose of a full and complete inquiry and investigation into the feasibility and propriety of the establishment of a general parcel-post commission of six persons, three of whom shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and three by the President of the Senate, is constituted, with full power to appoint clerks, stenographers, and experts to assist them in this work. They shall review the testimony already taken on the subject of parcel post by Senate and House committees and take such other testimony as they deem desirable. For the purpose of defraying the expenses of this commission the sum of \$25,000 is hereby appropriated, out of the moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

"Sec. 9. That from and after the 1st day of July, 1912, the compensation of rural letter carriers for carrying the mail six days each week on standard routes of 24 miles in length shall be the sum of \$1,074 per annum, to be paid monthly; and on routes exceeding 24 miles in length, the sum of \$44.75 per mile per annum for each mile in excess of 24 miles; and on routes under 24 miles in length, a corresponding reduction of compensation per mile per annum shall be paid; on routes carrying the mail three days of each week of the same length as above, the pay shall be one-half the compensation there provided.

"Sec. 10. That after June 30, 1912, experimental mail delivery may be established, under such regulations as the Postmaster General may prescribe, in towns and villages having post offices of the second or third class that are not by law now entitled to free-delivery service, and the sum of \$100,000 is hereby appropriated to enable postmasters to employ the necessary assistance to deliver the mail in such villages, and the amount to be expended at any office shall not exceed \$1,800 a year.

"Sec. 11. That the sum of \$400,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to enable the Postmaster General to continue the establishment, maintenance, and extension of postal savings depositories, including the reimbursement of the Secretary of the Treasury for expenses incident to the preparation, issue, and registration of the bonds authorized by the act of June 25, 1910: *Provided*, That out of such sum an amount not to exceed \$10,000 may be expended for the rental, if necessary, of quarters for the central office of the Postal Savings System in the District of Columbia: *And provided further*, That all expenditures in the Postal Savings System shall be audited by the Auditor for the Post Office Department: *And provided further*, That the Postmaster General shall select and designate the post offices which are to be postal savings depository offices, and shall appoint and fix the compensation of such superintendents, inspectors, and other employees as may be necessary in conducting, supervising, and directing the business of such offices, including the employees of a central office at Washington, D. C., and shall prescribe the hours during which postal savings depository offices shall remain open. He shall also from time to time make rules and regulations with respect to the deposits in and withdrawals of

moneys from postal savings depositories and the issue of pass books or such other devices as he may adopt as evidence of such deposits or withdrawals. The provisions of the act approved June 25, 1910, are hereby modified accordingly. The unexpended balance of the appropriation for the fiscal year 1912 of \$500,000 made by section 5 of the act approved March 4, 1911, for the Postal Savings System, is hereby reappropriated and made available during the fiscal year 1913 for the purposes mentioned in this section.

"Sec. 12. That the provision in the act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department, approved May 27, 1908, authorizing the designation of enlisted men of the Navy as Navy mail clerks and assistant Navy mail clerks, be amended to include in such designation enlisted men of the Marine Corps, by the insertion in the said provision, after the words 'United States Navy,' the words 'or Marine Corps.'

It shall also be in order, notwithstanding the general rules of the House, to consider in connection with said H. R. 21279 the following:

First, in connection with section 8 of the bill the following:

"That in order to promote the postal service and more efficiently regulate commerce between the several States, the Territories of the United States, the District of Columbia, the possessions of the United States, and foreign nations the contracts and agreements and arrangements of the several express companies with the several railroad companies or other common carriers of the United States, its Territories, and the District of Columbia relating to the collecting, receiving, caring for, storing, dispatching, forwarding, and delivering by such railroad company or other common carriers of parcels, packets, and packages, and other express matter, as well as the franchises, operating equipment, cars, vehicles, horses, buildings, leases, as lessees, of buildings used in the conduct of the express business, and all other property or rights and privileges owned and used by such express companies as necessary and appropriate to such collecting, receiving, caring for, storing, dispatching, forwarding, and delivering of such parcels, packets, and packages, and express matter, are hereby declared to be, and the same are hereby, condemned and appropriated to and for the United States of America, to be used by it for such public purposes as may be proper in its various functions. That the words 'express company' as used in this act, shall be construed to include any corporation, joint-stock company, association, partnership, and individual, as far as engaged in the collecting, receiving, caring for, storing, dispatching, forwarding, and delivering of parcels, packets, packages, and other express matter, by rail or water. And the words 'railroad' or 'railway company' shall be construed to include any transportation agency by rail or water as far as used as a post route or in carrying express matter. On and after July 1, 1913, any railroad, steamship, or other transportation agency having a contract with any express company subject to this act shall transport and carry for the Post Office Department all matter transportable under said contract, and shall execute and perform with respect to such Post Office Department all such duties as have been customary under such contract in relation to the express company or companies named therein, and shall permit its agents and employees when required to continue to discharge such services in respect thereto, and upon like terms, without interference on its part.

"DUTY OF PRESIDENT AND POSTMASTER GENERAL.

"Sec. 2. That it shall be the duty of the President on the 1st day of July, 1913, to take charge and possession of all the property of such express companies condemned and appropriated by this act, in the name of and by the authority of the United States of America; and thereupon it shall be the duty of the Postmaster General to employ said property and facilities in conjunction with the postal service, and to henceforth conduct said express service.

"TOWERS OF POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT.

"Sec. 3. That it shall be the duty of the Postmaster General to make and promulgate such rules and regulations for carrying into effect the provisions of this act as he may deem necessary, not in conflict with the Constitution or laws of the United States: *Provided*, That all such rules and regulations shall be subject to review and revision by the Interstate Commerce Commission and the courts in like manner and with like effect as if said rules and regulations had been made and promulgated by a railway company or other common carrier.

"COMPENSATION FOR RAILROAD TRANSPORTATION.

"Sec. 4. That during the months of August and December, 1912, and April, 1913, the weights of matter carried over the respective railroads, under contracts with the express companies during the pendency thereof, shall be taken for each railroad company in respect to such contract, under regulations to be provided by the Post Office Department; and the amount of money paid for the carriage thereof to the railroad shall be divided by the mileage of such railroad over which such matter is carried; and thereafter the Postmaster General shall, if the railroad company consent thereto, cause to be paid to such railroad company the amount per mile owing to such railroad under such contract as thus computed; and thereafter annually at such times as may be determined upon by the Postmaster General such matter shall be weighed, and the railroad company shall be paid monthly for the excess weight carried by it, over the first weighing herein provided, such sums as may be agreed upon for such excess weight; but if such Postmaster General and such railroad company shall fail to agree upon a basis of compensation for such excess weights, then the same shall be paid for according to the terms and provisions of the contract condemned in such case.

"RENEWAL OF TRANSPORTATION CONTRACTS.

"Sec. 5. That at the expiration or termination of any contract between an express company and a railroad condemned by this act (or at any time before, if such railroad company shall consent thereto) the Postmaster General may contract with such railroad company for the transportation of postal express matter; and if deemed advantageous, upon cars provided by the postal department, which may be transferred without unloading onto the lines of other railroad companies, at such rates of compensation and upon such principles of computation thereof as may be agreed upon, with the right of review and revision of the same by the Interstate Commerce Commission as hereinafter provided. And in case the Postmaster General and such railroad company, after the expiration or termination of the contract with an express company, shall fail to agree upon the terms and provisions of the renewal thereof, they shall submit their respective contentions with reference thereto to the said Interstate Commerce Commission, which shall thereupon have plenary power to declare the terms and provisions which said contract shall contain; but from any determination with respect to any such contract the terms and provisions of which have been so declared by the said Interstate Commerce Commission an appeal shall lie to the Court of Commerce, which shall enjoy like power to amend and revise the same.

"APPRAISEMENT OF EXPRESS COMPANIES."

"SEC. 6. That immediately after the passage of this act it shall be the duty of the Interstate Commerce Commission to appraise the value of the property condemned and appropriated by the United States of America in section 1 of this act and award to the respective express companies just compensation therefor. Each commissioner shall take oath to justly perform such duties before some judge of the courts of the United States. The said Interstate Commerce Commission shall have power, and it shall be its duty to summon witnesses, with books and papers, before it, for either of the parties, and require such witnesses to testify, and it shall give to each party a full hearing; and it shall be the duty of such commission, on or before the 7th day of May, 1913, to file a separate award of appraisal for each express company condemned under this act, with respect to the property condemned, and give notice of the filing of such award to the Postmaster General and to such express company. And if either party shall be dissatisfied with the amount of said award, the same may, upon appeal by either party, be reviewed and revised by the Court of Commerce, sitting as a court of review, with respect thereto; and from its determination a further appeal may be taken by either of the parties to the Supreme Court of the United States.

"PROVISIONS FOR COMPENSATION OF EXPRESS COMPANIES."

"SEC. 7. That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to make payment to such express companies of the money adjudged to be due them, as aforesaid, out of the Treasury of the United States, and said express companies shall be entitled to payment of such final award as compensation from the Treasury of the United States and the Treasurer thereof, and the amounts of said award are hereby appropriated to the parties entitled thereto out of the Treasury of the United States.

"DUTIES OF COMMON CARRIERS."

"SEC. 8. That any willful failure or refusal by any railroad company or other common carrier, subject to the provisions of this act, to perform any service required by this act or by any lawful rule or regulation made and promulgated by the Postmaster General in pursuance of this act, or of any lawful ruling, finding, or determination of the Interstate Commerce Commission, or of any order, judgment, or decree of any court of the United States of competent jurisdiction shall constitute a misdemeanor which, upon indictment and conviction, shall be punished by a fine not exceeding \$1,000.

"POWERS OF POSTMASTER GENERAL."

"SEC. 9. That the Postmaster General shall have power to rent, lease, or purchase real estate and personal property, supplies, cars, and equipment for use by his department for the purposes of this act. He shall have power to condemn in the name of the United States any property, real, personal, or mixed, which he may deem necessary for the efficient operation of the service, but the said Interstate Commerce Commission shall first value and file its award therefor as hereinbefore specified."

Second. On page 25, at the end of line 8 of H. R. 21279, the following:

"That for the purposes of this act certain highways of the several States, and the civil subdivisions thereof, are classified as follows:

"Class A shall embrace roads of not less than 1 mile in length, upon which no grade shall be steeper than is reasonably and practically necessary in view of the natural topography of the locality, well drained, with a road track not less than 9 feet wide composed of shells, vitrified brick, or macadam, graded, crowned, compacted, and maintained in such manner that it shall have continuously a firm, smooth surface, and all other roads having a road track not less than 9 feet wide of a construction equally smooth, firm, durable, and expensive, and continuously kept in proper repair. Class B shall embrace roads of not less than 1 mile in length, upon which no grade shall be steeper than is reasonably and practically necessary in view of the natural topography of the locality, well drained, with a road track not less than 9 feet wide composed of burnt clay, gravel, or a proper combination of sand and clay, sand and gravel, or rock and gravel, constructed and maintained in such manner as to have continuously a firm, smooth surface. Class C shall embrace roads of not less than 1 mile in length upon which no grade shall be steeper than is reasonably and practically necessary in view of the natural topography of the locality, with ample side ditches, so constructed and crowned as to shed water quickly into the side ditches, continuously kept well compacted and with a firm, smooth surface by dragging or other adequate means, so that it shall be reasonably passable for wheeled vehicles at all times. That whenever the United States shall use any highway of any State, or civil subdivision thereof, which falls within classes A, B, and C, for the purpose of transporting rural mail, compensation for such use shall be made at the rate of \$25 per annum per mile for highways of class A, \$20 per annum per mile for highways of class B, and \$15 per annum per mile for highways of class C. The United States shall not pay any compensation or toll for such use of such highways other than that provided for in this section, and shall pay no compensation whatever for the use of any highway not falling within classes A, B, or C. That any question arising as to the proper classification of any road used for transporting rural mail shall be determined by the Secretary of Agriculture. That the compensation herein provided for shall be paid at the end of each fiscal year by the Treasurer of the United States upon warrants drawn upon him by the Postmaster General to the officers entitled to the custody of the funds of the respective highways entitled to compensation under this act.

"The provisions of this paragraph shall go into effect on the 1st day of July, 1913."

Third. After line 15, page 28, of H. R. 21279 the following:

"That it shall be unlawful for any person or persons, or association or corporation, to enter or to have entered into the mails of the United States any newspaper, magazine, or other periodical of like kind, unless such publication shall have plainly printed in a conspicuous place therein the name or names of the managing editor or managing editors, the name or names of the publisher or publishers, and the name or names of the owner or owners, including all stockholders owning stock of the par value of \$500 or more, of such periodical publication. Any person, association, or corporation who shall violate any provision of this act shall be punished, for each violation of any provision thereof, by a fine of not less than \$100 nor more than \$1,000."

On the subject of parcel post and postal express, when reached in order, there shall be 15 hours of general debate, and on the other subjects included in this resolution there shall be 5 hours of general debate, to follow immediately on the adoption of this resolution.

During the reading of the foregoing the following occurred:

Mr. CANNON (interrupting the reading). Mr. Speaker, those of us who have not seen this rule can not follow the rapid and unusual reading of the Clerk.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I will state to the gentleman that 500 copies of this rule have been printed and placed before Members.

Mr. CANNON. Precisely; but I suppose the rule is to be considered at once, and for one, not having seen it until this morning, I would like to follow the reading of the Clerk.

The SPEAKER. The House will be in order. The Clerk will read slowly and distinctly.

The Clerk then concluded the reading of the resolution.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I desire to have corrected a clerical error which appears in the report which has just been read. On page 7 of the report, in the first line at the top of the page, the figure "8," after the word "line," should be "7," and I ask unanimous consent to have that correction made.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to substitute for the figure "8," after the word "line" in the first line on page 7 of the report, the figure "7." Is there objection?

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania how much time he thinks he or his side would desire for debate on the rule?

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to the gentleman that we have 45 minutes on a side.

Mr. MANN. Oh, Mr. Speaker, we would want more than that.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I should think several hours on a side should be granted. Many of us have read this rule for the first time.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. The gentleman understands that this is merely a rule to consider certain matters, and four days of general debate are provided under its provisions.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I think we better have a few hours of general debate on the rule and less time for speaking to empty benches in general debate on the bill afterwards.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. How much time would the gentleman from Illinois suggest?

Mr. MANN. We ought to have at least several hours on a side.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman seems to want more time than is actually necessary. It strikes me that an hour on a side would be sufficient.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, here is a rule providing that there shall be in order on the Post Office appropriation bill the substance of another bill that has never even been reported to the House by any committee—

Mr. DALZELL. Two other bills.

Mr. MANN. Another provision making in order on the Post Office appropriation bill a bill which has been reported by the Committee on Agriculture to the House; another provision making in order on the Post Office bill a provision I think that never has been introduced into the House, certainly never has been reported to the House.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. If the gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from Pennsylvania were not so wide apart, it seems we might agree. One says 45 minutes and the other several hours.

Mr. DALZELL. I spoke simply from the requests that have been made to me for time on this side.

Mr. MANN. Well, nobody could get a copy of this bill, unless members of the Committee on Rules, until this morning. I endeavored to get a copy yesterday and was unable to do so. I sent to the document room this morning and endeavored to get a copy and was unable to do so, and I could not get a copy until the House met to-day.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. It could not be made available until this morning; it was printed last night.

Mr. MANN. It could have been printed a week ago.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. It was not reported until yesterday.

Mr. MANN. I know; but it was acted upon by the committee longer ago than yesterday.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Oh, the gentleman is entirely mistaken; we acted yesterday afternoon and it was printed as soon as possible, and we were ready to furnish a copy at any time.

Mr. MANN. I knew several days ago what the Committee on Rules had done, and I supposed it was acted upon, but I did not know whether the Committee on Rules had acted upon it, but with the matter as now printed it would be impossible for me with convenience to read it, because I do not undertake to read breviter type.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Well, would the gentleman be satisfied with an hour and a quarter to a side?

Mr. MANN. Oh, I think we ought to have longer time.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. How much would the gentleman like to have?

Mr. MANN. Why not see how much the House wants?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I am trying to do that now.

Mr. MANN. Why not proceed and see?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I want to come to an agreement about time if I can.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Texas yield to the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I do.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. I would like to ask this question: Why can not we proceed to-day with the other portions of the Post Office bill and then bring this rule up to-morrow when we all would have an opportunity to read the rule and think and talk about it in the meantime?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. There are other important matters to-morrow, and they will have to come up.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Then let it come up on Saturday, if you please.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. There are also important matters for Saturday.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Then on Monday.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. You will have four days for general debate after this rule is adopted to discuss the merits of it.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Texas yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY]?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I do.

Mr. LANGLEY. I desire to ask the gentleman from Texas to yield to me to submit a parliamentary inquiry, which is whether it is in order to offer an amendment to this rule to return to a section of the bill upon which the committee has already passed; and if so, when that amendment will be in order?

The SPEAKER. It will be in order, if it is germane, until after the previous question is ordered.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to give notice that I shall offer such an amendment to that section—

Mr. MANN. May I ask the gentleman from Texas if he is going to move the previous question on the rule?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I do not like to, but probably shall have to do it. I would like for the House to have at least an hour and a quarter or an hour and a half to a side, if the gentleman will agree, to discuss this rule.

Mr. MANN. I am speaking of the previous question as applied to amendments to the rule, whether it is the intention of the gentleman to permit the House to pass upon propositions affecting the different propositions in the bill by amendment, to strike out anything in the rule, or to insert additional matter in the rule by way of amendment?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Yes; it is my intention to move the previous question.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I had not finished when I was interrupted. I was going to say that it is my purpose to offer at the proper time an amendment proposing to return to that section that was amended by the adoption of a proviso abolishing Sunday service.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman would have that privilege unless the previous question was ordered and providing his amendment was germane to anything in the proposed rule.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I will endeavor to make it germane.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Will my colleague on the Committee on Rules let the debate run for a time, and see about how much will be required?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I would prefer not to do that if we can come to an agreement. I am willing to agree to 3 hours discussion on this rule, 1 hour and 30 minutes on a side. In addition, there will be 4 days general debate on all propositions in here, and then a discussion under the 5-minute rule, and that will give abundance of time.

Mr. CAMPBELL. In making the suggestion, I was thinking that it would not consume as much as three hours under the five-minute rule.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. And that is twice as much as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL], who has been always conservative as to granting time, has asked for.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I hardly think that three hours will be consumed in this debate.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that three hours of discussion be devoted to the rule, and that at the end of that time the chairman be recognized for the purpose of moving the previous question on the rule, and that the time be equally divided between this side and the other side of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that debate on this rule be limited to three hours, one half to be controlled by himself and the other half by the gen-

tleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL], at the end of which time the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] will be recognized to move the previous question.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois will state it.

Mr. MANN. If three hours of general debate should be allowed—an hour and a half on a side—would not the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] be entitled to the floor at the end of three hours and have the right to move the previous question?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I think so.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks so; but the gentleman put it in his request and the Chair did not see any particular harm in stating the request as made.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman would have the right, an objection to it would not make any difference.

The SPEAKER. At the end of three hours the gentleman in charge of the resolution can move the previous question.

Mr. LEVER. Will the gentleman from Texas yield for a question?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I yield for a question.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, there are a number of propositions involved in this rule, some coming from one committee and some from another committee. On the parcel-post and postal-express proposition there are to be 15 hours of general debate, and on other propositions involved in the bill, including the road proposition, coming from the Agricultural Committee, there are to be five hours of general debate. I would like to ask the gentleman who will control the time on each proposition?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. As I understand it, an agreement has already been reached by which the time is to be controlled by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON] on one side and the senior Republican [Mr. DALZELL] on the other side of the House.

Mr. LEVER. I had in mind that inasmuch as the propositions came from different committees, the time might be controlled by the members of the committees from which the propositions came.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I think there will be no trouble about an agreement as to division. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON] is fair.

Mr. LEVER. We all concede that; but I thought the gentleman had something in his mind as to the matter about which I have spoken.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK]?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I do.

Mr. MURDOCK. I want to ask a question about this rule. The first paragraph says:

Resolved, That after the adoption of this rule it shall be in order, in the consideration of H. R. 21279, a bill making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, and for other purposes, to consider the new legislation on said bill hereinafter mentioned notwithstanding the general rules of the House.

Now, my understanding is that the gentleman and the Committee on Rules were trying to save these provisions from a point of order as to their being new legislation. Now, does not the language of the resolution here also save these provisions from all other points of order? Would it be possible under this rule, if adopted, to make a point of order under the Holman rule against certain amendments?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Oh, I think that the rule preserves those matters, so that they may be considered by the House.

Mr. MURDOCK. This is pretty broad, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Yes; it is very broad. It was intended to be broad, so that the House might consider these matters of legislation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask that the request be submitted.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, as I understand from a hasty hearing of the reading of the rule, this rule, if adopted, makes in order any general legislation touching matters referred to by way of amendments that are germane.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. The gentleman is entirely correct. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the request be submitted to the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] asks unanimous consent that debate on this proposed rule be limited to three hours, one half of the time to be controlled by himself and the other half by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL], and that at the end of the three hours he be recognized to move the previous question. Is there objection?

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, that means that I will not have the privilege of offering the amendment which I indicated a while ago. It has not yet been prepared. I am working on it now, and I do not want to be cut off.

The SPEAKER. That means, if the previous question is sustained, that the gentleman will be cut out. If it is voted down, anybody can offer an amendment that is germane.

Mr. LANGLEY. Yes; I know that. I will ask the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] if he will not agree that at the close of the general debate, before he moves the previous question, I may—

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I can not hear what the gentleman says.

Mr. LANGLEY. I was explaining that I have not yet had an opportunity to prepare the amendment to which I referred a moment ago, but that I am getting it ready, and I want consent to offer it before you are recognized to move the previous question.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. What is the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. LANGLEY. I want to propose an amendment which will provide that a motion will be in order to return to the paragraph of the bill to which an amendment was adopted by the committee the other day abolishing Sunday post-office service.

Mr. FINLEY. That is in the Post Office bill?

Mr. LANGLEY. Certainly.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I have no objection to the gentleman's getting unanimous consent to return to that part of the bill and offering an amendment.

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. LANGLEY. Yes; but somebody else might have objection.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I do.

Mr. FINLEY. It will be in order to move to return to that, I take it, if it is the will of the House. There will be no trouble about that.

Mr. LANGLEY. My understanding of the rule is different, if the gentleman means it can be done by a majority vote. I understand that it will require unanimous consent to return to that paragraph.

Mr. FINLEY. The rule under consideration does not apply to the provisions of the bill that have been passed over.

Mr. LANGLEY. Of course not. That is just what I am driving at. I want to amend it so that it will apply.

Mr. FINLEY. The rule under consideration here has no reference to the body of the bill, which has been read under the five-minute rule. It has no reference at all to it.

Mr. LANGLEY. Everybody knows that, I take it, unless it is the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. FINLEY. Of course, I understand the gentleman from Kentucky has another idea about it; otherwise he would not be attempting to amend the rule here.

Mr. FITZGERALD. If the gentleman from Kentucky will consult me privately about it, I can tell him how that can be done. [Laughter.]

Mr. LANGLEY. I know the gentleman from New York thinks he can tell me, and doubtless he can to his satisfaction, but—

Mr. FITZGERALD. When the bill is in the House the gentleman can demand a separate vote on that amendment.

Mr. LANGLEY. Of course, I understand that; but there will be no opportunity for debate then, and I have secured some important data since the amendment was adopted that I want to bring to the attention of the committee.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER]?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I yield for a question.

Mr. RAKER. A question, that is all, on the first part of the rule, which provides, following the word "Resolved"—

That after the adoption of this rule it shall be in order in the consideration of H. R. 21279—

And then it goes on to say that the new legislation shall be considered. I want to ask the gentleman a question, whether or not, in considering this new legislation, or any part of it, Members will be permitted to add amendments to the proposed new legislation set out in the rule?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Undoubtedly, if they are germane.

Mr. RAKER. Just one more question. Would the subject of star routes be germane to the bill where it provides for parcel-post on rural-delivery routes?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. The gentleman would have to ask the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole to make that ruling. I do not happen to be in touch with him, and do not know his idea.

Mr. RAKER. I would like to get a little information on that matter, as I think the question of star routes ought to be con-

sidered with reference to parcel post when applied to rural routes.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I think probably the gentleman will have no difficulty when he gets to that.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] will consent that I may have the opportunity of offering this amendment before the previous question is put, I shall not object.

Mr. SHERLEY. If the gentleman from Texas does consent, I will object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. LANGLEY. I object.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas moves the previous question.

The question being taken, the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and eighty-three Members present, not a quorum. The Doorkeeper will close the doors; the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees. Those in favor of ordering the previous question will, when their names are called, answer "aye," those opposed will answer "no," and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 164, nays 114, answered "present" 13, not voting 100, as follows:

YEAS—164.

Adair	Dixon, Ind.	Hull	Roddenberry
Aiken, S. C.	Donohoe	Humphreys, Miss.	Rothermel
Alexander	Doremus	Jacoway	Rouse
Allen	Driscoll, D. A.	Johnson, Ky.	Rubey
Ansberry	Dupré	Johnson, S. C.	Rucker, Mo.
Ashbrook	Edwards	Jones	Russell
Austin	Ellerbe	Kindred	Saunders
Ayres	Estopinal	Kinkaid, N. J.	Scully
Barnhart	Evans	Kitchin	Shackleford
Bathrick	Faison	Konop	Sharp
Beall, Tex.	Ferguson	Korhly	Sherwood
Bell, Ga.	Ferris	Lamb	Sisson
Blackmon	Finley	Langham	Slomp
Boehne	Flood, Va.	Lee, Pa.	Small
Booher	Floyd, Ark.	Legare	Smith, N. Y.
Borland	Foster	Lever	Smith, Tex.
Broussard	Fowler	Lewis	Stedman
Brown	Francis	Lithicum	Stephens, Miss.
Buchanan	Garner	Littlepage	Stephens, Nebr.
Bulkley	Garrett	Lloyd	Stephens, Tex.
Burke, Wis.	George	McDermott	Stone
Burnett	Glass	McGillcuddy	Sulzer
Byrnes, S. C.	Godwin, N. C.	McKellar	Sweet
Byrns, Tenn.	Goeke	Macon	Talbot, Md.
Candler	Goodwin, Ark.	Maguire, Nebr.	Talcott, N. Y.
Cantrill	Graham	Maher	Taylor, Colo.
Carlin	Gray	Martin, Colo.	Townsend
Carter	Gregg, Pa.	Moon, Tenn.	Tribble
Claypool	Hamlin	Murray	Turnbull
Cline	Hammond	Oldfield	Tuttle
Collier	Hardwick	O'Shaunessy	Underhill
Conry	Hardy	Padgett	Underwood
Covington	Harrison, Miss.	Page	Watkins
Cullop	Hay	Peters	Webb
Daugherty	Hayden	Porter	Whitacre
Davenport	Helm	Post	White
Davis, W. Va.	Henry, Tex.	Raker	Wickliffe
Dent	Holland	Rauch	Wilson, N. Y.
Denver	Howard	Redfield	Wilson, Pa.
Dickinson	Hughes, Ga.	Reilly	Witherspoon
Defenderfer	Hughes, N. J.	Richardson	Young, Tex.

NAYS—114.

Akin, N. Y.	Esch	Lee, Ga.	Payne
Anderson, Minn.	Farr	Lenroot	Pepper
Anthony	Fitzgerald	Levy	Pickett
Bartholdt	Focht	Lindbergh	Plumley
Bartlett	Foss	Littleton	Pray
Bates	French	Longworth	Prince
Berger	Gardner, N. J.	Loud	Prouty
Bowman	Gillett	McGuire, Okla.	Rees
Branley	Goldfogle	McKenzie	Roberts, Mass.
Browning	Good	McKinney	Sherley
Burke, S. Dak.	Green, Iowa	McLaughlin	Slayden
Burleson	Hamilton, Mich.	Maly	Sloan
Butler	Harris	Mann	Smith, J. M. C.
Calder	Hartman	Martin, S. Dak.	Smith, Saml. W.
Campbell	Hawley	Miller	Speer
Cannon	Hayes	Mondell	Steenerson
Catlin	Helgesen	Moore, Pa.	Sulloway
Cooper	Higgins	Morgan	Tilson
Crumpacker	Howland	Morrison	Towney
Currier	Hubbard	Morse, Wis.	Volstead
Curry	Humphrey, Wash.	Mott	Warburton
Dalzell	Kendall	Murdoch	Wedemeyer
Danzon	Kent	Nedham	Wilder
Davis, Minn.	Kinkaid, Nebr.	Nelson	Willis
Dies	Knowland	Norris	Wood, N. J.
Dodds	Kopp	Nye	Young, Kans.
Draper	Lafan	Palmer	Young, Mich.
Dyer	La Follette	Parran, Pa.	
	Langley		

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—13.

Anderson, Ohio	Fuller	McMorran	Stevens, Minn.
Andrus	Gregg, Tex.	Moon, Pa.	
Burgess	Hobson	Powers	
Davidson	McCall	Riordan	

NOT VOTING—100.

Adamson	Gallagher	Konig	Rodenberg
Ainey	Gardner, Mass.	Lafferty	Rucker, Colo.
Ames	Gould	Lawrence	Sabath
Barchfeld	Greene, Mass.	Lindsay	Sells
Bradley	Griest	Lobeck	Sheppard
Burke, Pa.	Gudger	McCoy	Simmons
Callaway	Guernsey	McCreary	Sims
Clark, Fla.	Hamill	McHenry	Smith, Cal.
Clayton	Hamilton, W. Va.	McKinley	Sparkman
Connell	Hanna	Madden	Stack
Copley	Harrison, N. Y.	Matthews	Stanley
Cox, Ind.	Haugen	Mays	Stephens, Cal.
Cox, Ohio	Heald	Moore, Tex.	Sterling
Crago	Heflin	Moss, Ind.	Switzer
Cravens	Henry, Conn.	Neeley	Taggart
Curley	Hensley	Olmsted	Taylor, Ala.
De Forest	Hill	Patten, N. Y.	Taylor, Ohio
Dickson, Miss.	Hinds	Pou	Thayer
Doughton	Houston	Pujo	Thistlewood
Driscoll, M. E.	Howell	Rainey	Thomas
Dwight	Hughes, W. Va.	Randell, Tex.	Utter
Fairchild	Jackson	Ransdell, La.	Vreeland
Fields	James	Reyburn	Weeks
Fordney	Kahn	Roberts, Nev.	Wilson, Ill.
Fornes	Kennedy	Robinson	Woods, Iowa

So the previous question was ordered.

The following pairs were announced:

For the session:

Mr. RIORDAN with Mr. ANDRUS.

Mr. PUJO with Mr. McMORRAN.

Mr. ADAMSON with Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota.

Mr. FORNES with Mr. BRADLEY.

Until further notice:

Mr. SIMS with Mr. WILSON of Illinois.

Mr. SHEPPARD with Mr. WOODS of Iowa.

Mr. SABATH with Mr. VREELAND.

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado with Mr. UTER.

Mr. THOMAS with Mr. SWITZER.

Mr. TAGGART with Mr. STERLING.

Mr. STANLEY with Mr. STEPHENS of California.

Mr. STACK with Mr. SMITH of California.

Mr. ROBINSON with Mr. SIMMONS.

Mr. RANDELL of Louisiana with Mr. SELLS.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas with Mr. ROBERTS of Nevada.

Mr. POU with Mr. OLMSTED.

Mr. PATTEN of New York with Mr. MATTHEWS.

Mr. NEELEY with Mr. MCKINLEY.

Mr. MOSS of Indiana with Mr. MCCREARY.

Mr. MOORE of Texas with Mr. DWIGHT.

Mr. MCHENRY with Mr. LAWRENCE.

Mr. MCCOY with Mr. KAHN.

Mr. LOBECK with Mr. JACKSON.

Mr. LINDSAY with Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia.

Mr. KONIG with Mr. HOWELL.

Mr. HEFLIN with Mr. HILL.

Mr. HAMILL with Mr. HENRY of Connecticut.

Mr. GUDGER with Mr. HEALD.

Mr. FIELDS with Mr. GUERNSEY.

Mr. DOUGHTON with Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts.

Mr. DICKSON of Mississippi with Mr. CRAGO.

Mr. CURLEY with Mr. FORDNEY.

Mr. CRAVENS with Mr. COPLE.

Mr. CLAYTON with Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK of Florida with Mr. BARCHFELD.

Mr. CALLAWAY with Mr. AMES.

Mr. ANDERSON with Mr. AINEY.

Mr. THAYER with Mr. GRIEST.

Mr. MAYS with Mr. THISTLEWOOD.

Mr. GALLAGHER with Mr. FULLER.

Mr. RAINEY with Mr. MADDEN.

Mr. COX of Ohio with Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio.

Mr. HOUSTON with Mr. MOON of Pennsylvania.

Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama with Mr. RODENBERG.

Mr. HOBSON with Mr. FAIRCHILD.

Mr. SPARKMAN with Mr. DAVIDSON.

Mr. COX of Indiana with Mr. REYBURN.

Mr. HINDS with Mr. GOULD.

Mr. CONNELL with Mr. KENNEDY.

For two weeks from to-day (April 18):

Mr. JAMES with Mr. MCCALL.

From April 13 to May 4:

Mr. HENSLEY with Mr. HANNA.

From April 17 to May 1:

Mr. BURGESS with Mr. WEEKS.

From April 11 to April 21:

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia with Mr. DE FOREST.

From April 18 to April 21:

Mr. GREGG of Texas with Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, did the gentleman from New York, Mr. FAIRCHILD, vote?

The SPEAKER. He did not.

Mr. HOBSON. I voted "aye." I wish to withdraw my vote and answer "present."

The Clerk called the name of Mr. HOBSON, and he answered "present," as above recorded.

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. A quorum is present. Further proceedings under the call are dispensed with, and the Doorkeeper will open the doors. The gentleman from Texas has 20 minutes and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] 20 minutes.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, recognizing the importance of the matters embraced in the proposed rule, I desire to submit a request for unanimous consent. I ask unanimous consent that there be two hours devoted to the discussion of the rule, one hour to be controlled by myself and one hour to be controlled by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that debate on this rule be confined to two hours, one hour to be controlled by himself and one hour by the gentleman from Pennsylvania. Is there objection?

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to say to the gentleman from Texas that I have been assured by the chairman of the committee and others that an understanding has been reached that the provision in the section to which I have referred, abolishing Sunday service, will be modified so as to satisfy those who are opposed to the amendment, and for that reason I no longer desire to interpose any objection to the gentleman's request.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—

Mr. MANN. I will object. I will say to the gentleman from Kentucky that the matter he is interested in will be attended to later.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Illinois object to the request for two hours' debate?

Mr. MANN. No.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois was objecting to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. LANGLEY. I was not making any request. I was explaining why I no longer objected to the request of the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revoke the action of the House in ordering the previous question.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. That is not necessary.

The SPEAKER. It is not necessary. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The gentleman from Texas is entitled to one hour and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] to one hour.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is not my purpose to devote much time to a discussion of the proposed rule. A careful reading of the same will give sufficient explanation of its terms. This rule makes it in order to consider certain matters that are on the Post Office appropriation bill as proposed items of legislation. After it is adopted these matters will be made in order for the consideration of this House. They are most important items of legislation, and for several years there has been a cry pervading the country that the capacity of this body to deliberate on important issues which the people have considered and settled has been weakened. This rule simply brings before the American Congress some of the great issues settled by the American people in order that their Representatives may cast their votes and decide whether or not the legislation shall be enacted into law.

First, the rule makes in order a proposition to consider legislation touching the establishment of the parcel post and the parcel express. These issues have been discussed by voters throughout the length and breadth of this country. We understand pretty thoroughly the temper of the American people, and the time has come when this body should consider whether or not it will pass this bill.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Certainly.

Mr. DIES. I want to ask the gentleman if these several propositions to which he refers have been referred to the committees of the House, have been considered by those committees, and if those committees have reported upon them before they were brought in by the Committee on Rules?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. All except two; and those two, as I understand it, will shortly be reported to the House; but those

can only be offered as amendments, which will be in order when the matter is reached in the bill.

Mr. DIES. Then, I want to ask the gentleman this question: What information can the ordinary layman in this House have if matters are precipitated upon the House which have not been referred to or considered or reported upon by the various committees of the House appointed for that purpose?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. They have all been reported except two, and those two will be reported and be in order as amendments; and I say to the gentleman that no Representative of the people should consider it an issue precipitated upon this House, but should be ready to meet such questions as the parcel post whenever the Rules Committee brings it before this body in order that it may consider it. [Applause.]

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I can not yield further, for I have not the time.

Mr. MANN. But the gentleman said all but one proposition had been considered by committees of the House. Are there not two propositions that have not been reported by any committee?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Oh, the Barnhart proposition respecting the ownership of newspapers has not been reported by a committee. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I simply rose to call that to the attention of the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have not the time and can not yield.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I believe my colleague will not do me the injustice to leave it where it is, with what he has said respecting the question of the parcel post. There is no contention about that; but is not the gentleman's proposition one for a parcel express? That has not been reported by a committee.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. My colleague is correct. That is true, but will be reported, as I understand it; and this only gives consideration.

Mr. Speaker, there is no use in all of this agitation about the consideration of these questions. If you are for a parcel post, you can vote for it; if you are opposed to it, you can vote against it; if you are for the parcel express, you can vote for it, or you may vote against it if you are against it, whenever it is reached.

As I was proceeding to say, there have been some criticisms that this body has lost its capacity for deliberation. As an humble agent and instrument of the membership of this House, let me say that I conceive it to be the duty of the Committee on Rules, whenever it is thoroughly understood that the membership desires to consider any important proposition, that we, as their agents and representatives, should bring those matters before the Congress and let them be considered in an orderly fashion. What does this rule propose? To make the parcel post and the parcel express in order to be considered, and only to be considered, when they are reached in regular order, and that there shall be devoted to their consideration 15 hours of general debate, 3 days or more; that after the general debate upon those subjects is exhausted, the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union then shall proceed to consider them under the 5-minute rule, and may consider them just as long as they wish. I shall not undertake to specify the various items embraced within the provisions of the rule. Most of them have been reported from the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, as provided for in resolution 444, introduced by the chairman of that committee. The parcel post is not the only one included in the provisions of this resolution. There are others of serious import, and most of them ought to become law.

And the only way to make them effective as the law of this country is to make them in order on this bill, so that when the Post Office appropriation bill goes through the routine of another body and comes back to this House it will have been considered, will not have been pigeonholed, and the right of the people to have consideration lost at this session and perhaps during both sessions of Congress. [Applause on the Democratic side.] That is all. Gentlemen talk about legislation by riders not being a desirable way to legislate. Why, gentlemen, if you have a meritorious proposition that you can defend, that is just, that is in the interest of the American people, I undertake to say that there is no better time to consider it than the first opportunity when you can get it before the legislative body. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Now, let us meet the questions as they are presented. They are set out at length in the proposed rule. There will be plenty of time for the membership to

read and carefully consider them, and when we have finished our work here no one can say that this House has suppressed legislation on matters of tremendous importance to the people, no one can claim that they have been sent to a committee and there pigeonholed, nor can they charge that the Committee on Rules has been recreant to the trust reposed in them. But on each and every occasion, whenever there is a demand by the membership of this House that they be given the right to consider legislation, then the committee has willingly brought it before this body to make whatever disposition is desired. There are other matters here of great importance. There is a proposal making it in order to require the owners of newspapers, magazines, and periodicals to print in a conspicuous place the names of the editors, the owners, and their stockholders, in order that the American people may see the men who stand behind the guns trained against public officials. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMS). Does the gentleman from Texas yield?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Yes; I will yield for just one question.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. I desire to ask the gentleman why he limits this simply to the owner of \$500 worth of stock?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Because we thought that when we can reach those who own as much as \$500 worth of stock we could reach all worth considering to rectify the evils, and if we went below \$500 worth of stock and take them in the names would be too numerous, because there would be too many stockholders. However, it is a matter of detail, and amendment can be offered when it comes before the House.

Mr. BURLESON. May I ask why the gentleman did not provide that the statement should also show the indebtedness of the newspapers and who controlled that indebtedness?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. If it is desirable to have that, then an amendment should certainly be offered, and I would gladly vote for it. Mr. Speaker, the proposed amendment establishes a principle that hereafter the newspapers and the periodicals and the journals that form public opinion are not authorized to give expression of their views unless the American people know the ownership of those weapons of public expression. Therefore I say this is an amendment that should be offered, should be in order, and made law. And I have no doubt that when we reach it Congress will place it on the Post Office appropriation bill. When it goes to the other body I predict that because it is on this appropriation bill as a rider it will remain there, come back here, and will go to the Executive of the United States and will be signed by him and become a law. Then we will know the ownership of these newspapers, magazines, journals, and so forth, before they can enter the mails of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that covers about all the features of this special rule that I desire to now discuss.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT].

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for the adoption of this rule [applause on the Democratic side], although there are some provisions in it that I regret are found there. The gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the Committee on Rules, has given a very accurate summary of the different provisions of this rule and of the matters that will be in order if this rule be adopted. The matter that I regret that is contained in the rule is the one relating to the condemnation of the property of express companies. A bill that is not before the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, a bill that is now pending before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, a bill that has not been reported upon by that committee, a bill that bristles with legal questions of the gravest nature and of the most far-reaching importance, ought not, in my judgment, be considered in this appropriation bill. But, Mr. Speaker, because I am opposed to that provision is not a reason for voting against this rule, for the reason that the good things in this rule so far outweigh the importance of those which, in my judgment, are bad that I think that every Member of this House ought to vote for the rule.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman doubt that if I demand, as I shall, a separate vote on the substantive proposition of this rule that we will have a right to vote upon these propositions?

Mr. LENROOT. I hope we will have.

Mr. MANN. We will, if the rules are observed.

Mr. LENROOT. If that is true, then I want to spend a moment or two further upon the question of the condemnation of the property of express companies.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman gets on to that subject I would like to ask him if he does not think in any legislation of this moment the House ought to take it up as separate bills, have it reported from the committee, and have consideration of each of the bills separately; let them go to the Senate and be considered there, and then let the President have his chance?

Mr. LENROOT. So far as this matter is concerned—of legislation of this particular nature. But I draw this distinction, Mr. Speaker, that with reference to most of the provisions in this rule they relate to matters that are directly affected by the appropriation, or, in other words, the matters affect the appropriation, and I would draw this line, that I will favor any amendment to remove a point of order, provided that amendment or that subject matter would be germane to the matter contained in the bill itself except for the fact that it is new legislation.

Mr. MURDOCK. Would the gentleman carry that form of legislation to the point that he would suspend the point of order that that legislation was new legislation if all legislation offered were germane?

Mr. LENROOT. Not necessarily; but if the matter of appropriation is so connected with that matter of legislation that they ought to be considered together, then I would be in favor of considering them together.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Before the gentleman proceeds I would like to ask a question. I would like to call attention to the last four lines of this rule, and ask why it was decided that 15 hours of general debate should be allowed when we reach section 8 of the bill, the question of parcel and postal express legislation, but as to other legislation in the bill there shall be but five hours immediately on the adoption of this resolution?

Mr. LENROOT. Because on the question of parcel post and express it is of such tremendous importance it could not be handled under the five-minute rule; that as to all other matters contained in the bill, they can be handled under the ordinary rules of the House.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. According to the way this reads, this is not under the five-minute rule. We are to have five hours of general debate when this rule is adopted.

Mr. LENROOT. And on that all the other rules apply when other matters are reached under the five-minute rule. So it enlarges the scope of debate rather than limits it, so far as that is concerned.

But, Mr. Speaker, to get back again to the question of express companies, I hope the gentleman is right that we may have a separate vote on that. I am not ready to say whether I favor the condemnation of the property of express companies or not. I wish to investigate that question further, but I am ready to say that that great question ought not to be considered in this appropriation bill, and, in reference to the bill itself, we do not know what this Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will report. They may report a substitute. If they report the bill at all, undoubtedly they will report a large number of amendments, and yet with this rule adopted the bill as reported from the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee will not be in order as an amendment, but the bill as introduced and referred to the committee will be the bill that is offered as an amendment.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LENROOT. I will.

Mr. LONGWORTH. When the gentleman refers to the acquisition of the property of the express company, to how much of this rule does it refer?

Mr. LENROOT. Beginning at the bottom of page 4, page 5, and all of page 6.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Thank you.

Mr. LENROOT. Here is a bill, Mr. Speaker, containing nine sections, and something that is unheard of is injecting a bill that is foreign to the committee from which this appropriation bill comes into this appropriation bill.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. LENROOT. I will.

Mr. SHERLEY. What does the gentleman say as to the propriety of incorporating in this rule a provision touching the good-roads movement, reported by a different committee—the Committee on Agriculture?

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, I shall be glad to answer that question. As a member of the Committee on Rules I was op-

posed to incorporating that proposition in this bill, for the reason that the gentleman suggests; but the Committee on Rules was presented with a petition signed by 235 Members of this House asking for the inclusion and consideration of that question in this bill, and I believe that whenever a majority of this House, and especially so large a majority as that, makes a request of that kind of the Committee on Rules it is the duty of the members of that committee to accede to that request, no matter how they might individually feel about it. [Applause.]

Mr. SHERLEY. If the gentleman will permit me further, it is in the power of the Committee on Rules to make in order the consideration of that measure as a separate proposition. As I understand it, the gentleman's position is that when a majority of the House, by petition, indicate their desire he should report a rule.

Mr. LENROOT. Yes; on any question as to the order in which matters are to be considered by this House I say "yes" to the gentleman.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman, by the way, understands that that is making the majority of this House suspend the rules?

Mr. LENROOT. It may. If it be so, I am for that. So far as this committee is concerned, if the majority of this House at any time desires the Committee on Rules to report a special rule I am going to vote to report that special rule and give the House an opportunity to consider the matters it wants to consider. [Applause.]

Now, Mr. Speaker, again getting back to this bill for the condemnation of express companies, I want to say this: That as the bill reads it is a questionable proposition as to whether without amendment it would not require the condemnation of many of the railroads in the United States. I wonder if that has been considered, so far as the phraseology of the bill is concerned? Further, I find a provision in the bill that gives to the Commerce Court—to abolish which Commerce Court a majority has brought in a bill to this House, a thing which I am in favor of doing—the same power over these questions, with reference to rates, that the Interstate Commerce Commission has. Are you in favor of that kind of a proposition? And do you think questions of that character should be considered in this appropriation bill?

And so I might go on, if I had the time, Mr. Speaker, and point out provision after provision with reference to this bill that ought to be considered by itself.

Furthermore, it curtails the right of amendment with reference to these propositions, and in this way: That if this express bill were here as an independent proposition an amendment would be in order, and an amendment to the amendment would be in order, while if it is brought in as provided in this bill the bill itself must be offered as an amendment, and only one amendment will then be in order to the bill instead of two, as would be the case if the bill were brought in as an independent proposition.

Mr. SHERLEY. Does not the gentleman understand that as to this provision for the taking over of the express companies the bill is amendable?

Mr. LENROOT. Certainly; but only one amendment would be in order.

Mr. SHERLEY. Only one amendment would be in order at one time. Later another amendment could be presented.

Mr. LENROOT. The gentleman does not understand me.

Mr. SHERLEY. It was because I did not that I interrupted the gentleman.

Mr. LENROOT. One amendment would be in order; but if it were an independent proposition on the floor of the House an amendment would be in order and an amendment to the amendment would be in order.

Mr. SHERLEY. The difference is simply a matter of time. You vote down one amendment, and after it is voted down you offer another.

Mr. LENROOT. That is true. But if one could vote on the amendment to the amendment he might vote for the amendment itself, but no opportunity is given to perfect it.

Mr. SHERLEY. You can perfect it by offering another amendment.

Mr. LENROOT. That may be true; but it does away with the privileges of the Members of the House as to the independent proposition.

I am in favor of a parcel post—a parcel post that will protect the rights of the country merchant as well as the rights of the farmer and others who are to be benefited.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LENROOT. Can I have five minutes more?

Mr. DALZELL. I yield five minutes more to the gentleman. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for five minutes more.

Mr. LENROOT. I am in favor of a parcel post with zone rates in it. I am in favor of putting on the statute books a parcel-post law to be followed, if necessary, afterwards by the condemnation of the property of the express companies. But I am not in favor, so far as I now understand the matter—and I want to say frankly that I reserve the right to change my mind after further investigation—I am not in favor of paying \$40,000,000 or \$50,000,000 for the property of the express companies now existing and their contracts and leases and franchises, only a tithe of which may perhaps be of any value whatever to this Government.

We owe nothing to the express companies of this country. No equitable considerations ought to prevail with reference to them, for they have been paying exorbitant dividends and have been exacting exorbitant rates. Whenever we do legislate upon this question I am in favor of standing strictly upon our legal rights with reference to them, without considering any matter of what otherwise they might be entitled to from an equitable consideration. [Applause.] So, Mr. Speaker, I am not in favor of paying them for their contracts, I am not in favor of paying them for their franchises. I am not in favor of condemning and paying them for their leases. If they are of any value to them afterwards, let them have them; but if this Government has any right to go into this at all, it seems to me it has a right to go into this business regardless of the express companies, and do it without paying several million dollars for property that is of no value. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that this provision will be voted out of the rule if an opportunity is offered.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DALZELL. Will the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] yield some of his time?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I yield five minutes to my colleague from Texas [Mr. HARDY].

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for this rule, because my experience shows me that skillful obstructionists, by the use of parliamentary devices, can and have in the past made the enactment of laws of the very highest importance, and almost universally demanded, a matter of tedious delay, like the decisions of our courts, stretching over years, until the heart grows weary and hope grows sick.

This rule does not prevent ample and free discussion. It suppresses no right to have every measure proposed under it weighed and approved or disapproved by the representatives of the people. It simply cuts the Gordian knot of obstruction. It strips privilege of its armor of technicalities in which it has wrapped itself, so that the spear of right and justice may reach it. I shall vote for this rule because I believe that the people ought to rule and to have their judgment and their demands, as evidenced by their Representatives' votes, brought to a focus and enacted into legislation. [Applause.]

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. HARDWICK. I yield five minutes to my colleague from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT].

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote against this rule. I am sorry that this side of the House has made it necessary to consider a rule of this character, and that we are returning to the old Republican methods.

In rare instances in the history of legislation has any party ever offered for the action of the House a rule of this kind, providing for the enactment, upon bills of this character, of special legislation not otherwise in order, but which is specifically prohibited by the rules. It is only in rare instances that the House has passed resolutions authorizing legislation upon appropriation bills, contrary to the rule which we ourselves have adopted and to the precedents of this House for a hundred years. I have hurriedly looked up the instances, and I find that since the provision was placed in the rules prohibiting legislating upon general appropriation bills there have been but few instances when that rule has been departed from by a special resolution. During the past 20 years I can find but 12 instances when it has been done. Those instances were to provide for the better administration of the Government, as it was claimed in each instance, and not for wholesale legislation on a variety of subjects, as this resolution authorizes. The Democratic Party during the last election went before the country and proclaimed that if we were given control of the House we would find a way to legislate, by reporting bills from the proper committees and by considering bills in the House, and we denounced in unmeasured terms the code of Cannon rules, and proclaimed we would not follow them. We have now rules of our own making, made in pursuance of the demands of the people. We have amended the rules and we

have Calendar Wednesday and two Mondays for suspension days and unanimous-consent days.

We went before the country protesting against the Cannon rules. We owe our majority, in a great measure, to that issue. But CANNON, in his palmiest days of czarism, and DALZELL, for years at the head of the Republican Rules Committee, never yet brought into this House a rule so far-reaching and revolutionary as this. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I am opposed to the rule, because the Democrats are in the majority on all these committees and if they really favor legislation along these lines, let the majority of Democrats on the committees report these bills. If they can not get sufficient time on Wednesdays and these other days provided for consideration of bills, then let the Committee on Rules bring in a special rule making such bills in order and let us act on them properly, decently, and in order.

Here we have the remarkable spectacle of an appropriation bill carrying the largest amount of money of any of our appropriation bills halted when we are endeavoring to hasten the time when we shall complete our business here; halted and stopped to consider bills, some of which have but recently been reported by a committee and some of which have not been acted on or reported by any committee. Can it be that the committees of this Democratic House are smothering in committee legislation that the people demand?

Mr. Chairman, I shall not vote for this rule, because I do not think the propositions submitted ought to be considered upon this appropriation bill. I am not for some of the propositions submitted in the rule and can not vote for them now, nor do I think the House should be called upon to consider them and act upon them in this "hodgepodge" method. I shall not vote to turn over to this Government the transportation business of the express companies, nor shall I vote for this proposition, which would bring a great burden and deficit upon the Post Office Department, by which it shall be turned from being a carrier of letters into being a carrier of the freight of the country, a first step in the direction that ultimately and almost inevitably leads to Government ownership and operation of railroads, express companies, and all the other agencies of public utility by which the people are served.

I am willing to vote for the propositions embraced in the bill reported by the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads; and if necessary to provide for their consideration in the pending bill by special rule, I will vote for such a rule. If this rule only provided for the consideration of the legislation proposed in the pending bill, I would not feel impelled to oppose it, but should support these provisions. I shall support the provision providing for the use of steel postal cars and the other provisions of the pending bill contained in sections 2 to 12, inclusive. To be more specific, I shall vote for the consideration of the following provisions of the pending bill, and if it be necessary to have a rule making their consideration in order, I would not protest against that rule.

The following are the parts of the bill I refer to:

Provided further, That after the 1st of July, 1917, the Postmaster General shall not approve or allow to be used or pay for any full railway post-office car not constructed of steel, steel underframe, or equally indestructible material, and not less than 20 per cent of the new equipment shall be put into operation annually after July, 1912; and after the passage of this act no contract shall be entered into for the construction of steel underframe cars.

SEC. 2. No contract for furnishing supplies to the Post Office Department or the postal service shall be made with any person who has entered, or proposed to enter, into any combination to prevent the making of any bid for furnishing such supplies, or to fix a price or prices therefor, or who has made any agreement, or given or performed, or promised to give or perform, any consideration whatever to induce any other person not to bid for any such contract, or to bid at a specified price or prices thereon; and if any person so offending is a contractor for furnishing such supplies, his contract may be annulled, and the person so offending shall be liable to a fine of not less than \$100 nor more than \$5,000, and may be further punished, in the discretion of the court, by imprisonment for not less than three months nor more than one year.

BONDS OF NAVY MAIL CLERKS.

SEC. 3. That every Navy mail clerk and assistant Navy mail clerk shall give bond to the United States in such penal sum as the Postmaster General may deem sufficient for the faithful performance of his duties as such clerk.

SEC. 4. When, after a weighing of the mails for the purpose of readjusting the compensation for their transportation on a railroad route, mails are diverted therefrom or thereto, the Postmaster General may, in his discretion, ascertain the effect of such diversion by a weighing of such mails for such number of successive working days as he may determine, and have the weights stated and verified to him as in other cases, and readjust the compensation on the routes affected accordingly; *Provided*, That no readjustment shall be made unless the diverted mails equal at least 10 per cent of the average daily weight on any of the routes affected.

SEC. 5. That on and after July 1 next following the passage of this act letter carriers in the City Delivery Service and clerks in first and second class post offices shall be required to work not more than eight hours a day; *Provided*, That the eight hours of service shall not extend over a longer period than 10 consecutive hours, and the schedules of duty of the employees shall be regulated accordingly.

That in cases of emergency, or if the needs of the service require, letter carriers in the City Delivery Service and clerks in first and second class post offices can be required to work in excess of eight hours a day, and for such additional services they shall be paid extra in proportion to their salaries as fixed by law.

That should the needs of the service require the employment on Sunday of letter carriers in the City Delivery Service and clerks in first and second class post offices, the employees who are required and ordered to perform Sunday work shall be allowed compensatory time on one of the six days following the Sunday on which they perform such service.

Sec. 6. That no person in the classified civil service of the United States employed in the postal service shall be removed therefrom except for such cause as will promote the efficiency of said service and for reasons given in writing, and the person whose removal is sought shall have notice of the same and of any charges preferred against him, and be furnished with a copy thereof, and also be allowed a reasonable time for personally answering the same in writing; and affidavits in support thereof; but no examination of witnesses nor any trial or hearing shall be required except in the discretion of the officer making the removal; and copies of charges, notice of hearings, answer, reasons for removal, and of the order of removal shall be made a part of the records of the proper department or office, as shall also the reasons for reduction in rank or compensation; and copies of the same shall be annually reported to Congress and furnished to the person affected upon request, and the Civil Service Commission also shall, upon request, be furnished copies of the same or the originals thereof: *Provided, however*, That membership in any society, association, club, or other form of organization of postal employees having for its objects, among other things, improvements in the condition of labor of its members, including hours of labor and compensation therefor and leave of absence, by any person or groups of persons in said postal service, or the presenting by any such person or groups of persons of any grievance or grievances to the Congress or any Member thereof shall not constitute or be cause for reduction in rank or compensation or removal of such person or groups of persons from said service.

Sec. 7. That after June 30, 1912, the Postmaster General may appoint railway postal clerks in such manner and of such respective grades and salaries as may be provided for in the annual appropriation acts for the service of the Post Office Department, for the purpose of sorting and distributing the mail in railway post offices, railway post-office terminals, and transfer offices, and for service in the offices of division superintendents and chief clerks, and as transfer clerks, and such other services as may pertain to the Railway Mail Service. Such clerks shall be designated as railway postal clerks and shall be divided into the following grades, with corresponding salaries per annum not exceeding the following rates:

Grade 1, at not exceeding \$900.

Grade 2, at not exceeding \$1,000.

Grade 3, at not exceeding \$1,100.

Grade 4, at not exceeding \$1,200.

Grade 5, at not exceeding \$1,300.

Grade 6, at not exceeding \$1,400.

Grade 7, at not exceeding \$1,500.

Grade 8, at not exceeding \$1,600.

Grade 9, at not exceeding \$1,700.

Grade 10, at not exceeding \$1,800.

Chief clerks, at not exceeding \$2,000.

The Postmaster General shall classify and fix the salaries of railway postal clerks, under such regulations as he may prescribe, in the grades provided by law; and for the purpose of organization and of establishing maximum grades to which promotions may be made successively as hereinafter provided, he shall classify railway post offices, terminal railway post offices, and transfer offices with reference to their character and importance in three classes, with salary grades as follows: Class A, \$900 to \$1,200; class B, \$900 to \$1,300; and class C, \$900 to \$1,500. He may assign to the offices of division superintendents and chief clerks such railway postal clerks as may be necessary and fix their salaries within the grades provided by law without regard to the classification of railway post offices.

After June 30, 1913, clerks in class A shall be promoted successively to grade 3, clerks in class B shall be promoted successively to grade 4, and clerks in class C shall be promoted successively to grade 5 at the beginning of the quarter following the expiration of a year's satisfactory service in the next lower grade. Promotions above these grades within the maximum grades of the classification may be made in the discretion of the Postmaster General for meritorious service. No promotion shall be made except upon evidence satisfactory to the Post Office Department of the efficiency and faithfulness of the employee during the preceding year.

A clerk of any grade of any classification of railway post offices, terminal railway post offices, transfer offices, or in the office of a division superintendent or chief clerk may be transferred and assigned to any classification of railway post offices, terminal railway post offices, transfer offices, or to an office of a division superintendent or chief clerk under such regulations as the Postmaster General may deem proper.

Clerks assigned as clerks in charge of crews consisting of more than one clerk shall be clerks of grades 5 to 10, inclusive, and may be promoted one grade only after three years' continuous, satisfactory, and faithful service in such capacity.

A clerk who falls of promotion because of unsatisfactory service may be promoted at the beginning of the second quarter thereafter or any subsequent quarter for satisfactory and faithful service during the intervening period.

Clerks in the highest grade in their respective lines or other assignments shall be eligible for promotion to positions of clerks in charge in said lines or corresponding positions in other assignments, and clerks assigned as assistant chief clerks and clerks in charge of crews consisting of more than one clerk, either assigned to the line, the transfer service, or to a terminal railway post office, and clerks in the highest grades in offices of division superintendents in their respective divisions shall, after two years of continuous service in such capacity, be eligible for promotion to positions of chief clerks in said division for satisfactory, efficient, and faithful service during the preceding two-year period under such regulations as the Postmaster General shall prescribe.

Whenever a clerk shall have been reduced in salary for any cause he may be restored to his former grade or advanced to an intermediate grade at the beginning of any quarter following the reduction for satisfactory and faithful service during the intervening period.

In filling positions below that of chief clerk no clerk shall be advanced more than one grade in a period of a year.

All clerks appointed to the Railway Mail Service and to perform duty on railway post offices shall reside at some point on the route to which

they are assigned; but railway postal clerks appointed prior to February 28, 1895, and now performing such duty shall not be required to change their residences, except when transferred to another line: *Provided, however*, That because of the reclassification herein provided no clerk shall receive less salary than before the passage of this act. All laws and parts of laws in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

Sec. 8. That hereafter postage shall be paid on matter of the fourth class at the rate of 12 cents per pound, except as herein provided.

That no article, package, or parcel shall be mailable as matter of the fourth class which exceeds 11 pounds in weight, except as herein provided.

That on each and all rural mail-delivery routes of the United States the postmaster at the starting point of such route shall, until June 30, 1914, receive and deliver to the carrier or carriers of said routes all articles, parcels, or packages not prohibited to the mails by law and falling under the definition of fourth-class matter and not weighing in excess of 11 pounds for transportation and delivery on said routes only; and the carriers shall receive at intermediate points on all rural routes such mail matter of the fourth class for delivery on their respective routes only.

That for the purpose of a full and complete inquiry and investigation into the feasibility and propriety of the establishment of a general parcel-post commission of six persons, three of whom shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and three by the President of the Senate, is constituted with full power to appoint clerks, stenographers, and experts to assist them in this work. They shall review the testimony already taken on the subject of parcel post by Senate and House committees and take such other testimony as they deem desirable. For the purpose of defraying the expenses of this commission the sum of \$25,000 is hereby appropriated, out of the moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

Sec. 9. That from and after the 1st day of July, 1912, the compensation of rural letter carriers for carrying the mail six days each week on standard routes of 24 miles in length shall be the sum of \$1,074 per annum, to be paid monthly; and on routes exceeding 24 miles in length, the sum of \$44.75 per mile per annum for each mile in excess of 24 miles; and on routes under 24 miles in length, a corresponding reduction of compensation per mile per annum shall be paid; on routes carrying the mail three days of each week of the same length as above, the pay shall be one-half the compensation there provided.

Sec. 10. That after June 30, 1912, experimental mail delivery may be established, under such regulations as the Postmaster General may prescribe, in towns and villages having post offices of the second or third class that are not by law now entitled to free-delivery service, and the sum of \$100,000 is hereby appropriated to enable postmasters to employ the necessary assistance to deliver the mail in such villages, and the amount to be expended at any office shall not exceed \$1,800 a year.

Sec. 11. That the sum of \$400,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to enable the Postmaster General to continue the establishment, maintenance, and extension of postal-savings depositories, including the reimbursement of the Secretary of the Treasury for expenses incident to the preparation, issue, and registration of the bonds authorized by the act of June 25, 1910: *Provided*, That out of such sum an amount not to exceed \$10,000 may be expended for the rental, if necessary, of quarters for the central office of the Postal Savings System in the District of Columbia: *And provided further*, That all expenditures in the Postal Savings System shall be audited by the Auditor for the Post Office Department: *And provided further*, That the Postmaster General shall select and designate the post offices which are to be postal-savings depository offices, and shall appoint and fix the compensation of such superintendents, inspectors, and other employees as may be necessary in conducting, supervising, and directing the business of such offices, including the employees of a central office at Washington, D. C., and shall prescribe the hours during which postal-savings depository offices shall remain open. He shall also from time to time make rules and regulations with respect to the deposits in and withdrawals of moneys from postal-savings depositories and the issue of pass books or such other devices as he may adopt as evidence of such deposits or withdrawals. The provisions of the act approved June 25, 1910, are hereby modified accordingly. The unexpended balance of the appropriation for the fiscal year 1912 of \$500,000 made by section 5 of the act approved March 4, 1911, for the Postal Savings System, is hereby reappropriated and made available during the fiscal year 1913 for the purposes mentioned in this section.

Sec. 12. That the provision in the act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department, approved May 27, 1908, authorizing the designation of enlisted men of the Navy as Navy mail clerks and assistant Navy mail clerks, be amended to include in such designation enlisted men of the Marine Corps, by the insertion in the said provision, after the words "United States Navy," of the words "or Marine Corps."

But, Mr. Speaker, I shall not vote for a proposition which will take the first step toward authorizing the Government of the United States to take sole management and control of every public road in my State over which a rural route may be established. I shall not in this instance, as I have not in the past, nor do I expect to in the future, vote for any measure that will lay on the General Government all the burdens of government which the several States and local bodies should bear. I shall not vote for a measure that will commit this great Government, composed of 48 States—I shall not vote to concentrate it into one and make it a paternalistic and socialistic government. I shall vote in this instance, as I have voted on all occasions, according to the Constitution as I understand it. This is a Government in which duties devolve upon it by the Constitution with limited and restricted powers. There are 48 separate and distinct governments that make up this one National Government, and they have some great duties to perform. I shall not in the vote I may cast on this rule forget that my State and the several States of this Union owe some duties to themselves and to their citizens. I shall not vote for that proposition which would advance them further and further in the direction of the destruction of the duties and the rights of

the States and the concentration and federalization of all the powers of government in Washington. [Applause.]

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, how much time did the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] use?

The SPEAKER. He used 13 minutes.

Mr. DALZELL. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCALL].

Mr. MCCALL. Mr. Speaker, I have always believed in the propriety of having the Committee on Rules report a special rule for the consideration of some special measure of importance that could not be reached in ordinary course upon the calendar. Many gentlemen of the House have been opposed to that power in the Committee on Rules. But I never have been in favor, and I am not in favor now, of the proposition to combine a number of diverse measures pending before different committees and logroll through the House a rule for their consideration.

There is one proposition here which may illustrate what I have said. It is proposed in this bill to require the Government to pay a toll for the use of local roads by its carriers. It provides a toll that I venture to say, in the case of some roads in this country, will amount to more than is spent by the town or the district in the maintenance of the road. If the Government should pay for the real wear and tear of the road caused by the carrier, it would not be a fraction of what it is proposed it shall pay. I do not believe that the people of the country care to be put in a position of receiving a gratuity, a vote from the National Treasury. A proposition like that makes this whole measure reek with graft from one end to the other. It means nothing less than that the Government is to take control in the end of the local roads in the country, to build them, to pay for them, and, of course, if it does that it should have jurisdiction over them. It is the wildest measure of centralization I have ever seen presented to the Congress and it is presented by the party that stands for local self-government. I can not give any rule which has a proposition of that kind in it my support. [Applause.]

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SPEER].

Mr. SPEER. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of this rule, because I am in favor of some of the legislation which the adoption of this rule will enable us to enact. I am in favor of a general parcel-post system so devised as to be beneficial to all of the people of this country. It is pretty well established now that unless something of this kind can be adopted in this Post Office appropriation bill it will not be adopted at all. I would prefer to vote separately on a proposition of this kind, but should we do so there is very little prospect that it would pass the Senate. Therefore, if we are to have any legislation on the subject during this session we must have it by virtue of this rule. Otherwise it will be objected to and eliminated by a point of order from the provision of the Post Office appropriation bill. Therefore I favor the adoption of this rule.

This does not mean that I favor the provisions of the Post Office appropriation bill. I do not think they are adequate; I do not think they are sufficient, but it will give us an opportunity when the discussion of them comes up to amend them and to adopt such provisions upon these subjects as we may deem proper and right. Without this rule we are bound hand and foot and can do nothing. I do not favor some of the wild propositions that are in this measure about paying toll for local roads, nor do I favor the condemnation of the express companies, because I believe that this Government has the right to institute a parcel-post system of its own and run it independently, as is done in many other civilized countries, and that the competition of the express companies will be beneficial to us in reducing rates.

There are other things in this rule which I favor. This rule will permit us to enact legislation to limit the time of employment of carriers to eight hours a day. Unless this rule is adopted that will be subject to a point of order and eliminated from the Post Office appropriation bill. It will permit an increase of the salaries of the carriers and clerks. Unless this rule be adopted, that can be objected out of your Post Office appropriation bill. Make no mistake, gentlemen. The objections to this rule upon the ground that it is violating the rules and precedents of the House, upon the ground that it is bringing in matters here that ought to be voted upon separately, are being made by those who want to kill this legislation in the end, and who are raising these objections now to prevent the House from acting upon the matters at all. [Applause.]

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL].

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, this rule will make in order 23 substantive propositions that otherwise would be out of

order upon the Post Office appropriation bill. Many of these propositions are of minor importance. It is doubtful if there would be any opposition to probably one-half of these propositions if they were to come up in the ordinary way. There are other important propositions here, propositions of the greatest possible importance. The propositions that ought to be agreed to without any extended debate and without serious opposition relate to the growth of the postal service, to the increase of the salaries of the postal employees, to the reduction of hours of laborers in the postal service. It makes in order the reclassification of the rural-route carriers, raising the salaries of the rural-route carriers—propositions that would be subject to a point of order if it were not for this rule. Without desiring to commit the House to every proposition covered in the rule and to make them in order on this bill, I favor the rule as it is now before the House. I shall reserve the right, when the time comes, in passing upon the questions made in order, to vote either for or against them as my judgment at that time dictates. I shall favor the increase in pay to clerks and carriers, and the provision making it proper for employees to organize and urge what is thought to be for their good.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Is this matter, contained on page 1 of the report, down to the bottom of page 4, one bill or is it a series of bills?

Mr. CAMPBELL. That is a series of propositions in the Post Office appropriation bill. They have been numbered in the rule for the sake of convenience. They are substantive propositions which are offered at different places in the Post Office appropriation bill. Each one of them would be subject to a point of order.

Mr. LONGWORTH. As to the parcel post only, is that covered in section 8 of this rule?

Mr. CAMPBELL. The question of a parcel post is covered in section 8.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I am not referring to the parcel express.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The parcel post is what is known as section 8.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Is that what the present bill contains substantially, or is there a difference there of a commission?

Mr. CAMPBELL. The commission is covered in the bill, which would also be out of order.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Then this section 8 of the rule is the bill as it stands to-day exactly, is it?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. So far as it relates to the parcel post?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio. Do I understand the adoption of this rule will permit an amendment increasing the salaries of the rural-route carriers?

Mr. CAMPBELL. This rule makes in order a proposition already in the Post Office bill reclassifying the rural routes and raising the pay of the carriers.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. I have not had time as yet to read the rule or to read fully the Goeke bill. I would like to ask if the Goeke bill is inserted word for word in the rule?

Mr. CAMPBELL. It is. There are propositions about which we all agree, and to which probably no Member of the House would object, and yet under the rules of the House they would not be in order on the Post Office appropriation bill without the adoption of this rule.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. On page 7 of the Rules report is a paragraph relating to the use of the mails for newspapers, requiring that the names of the publishers, editors, and stockholders shall be published.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Is that provision in the Post Office appropriation bill?

Mr. CAMPBELL. It is not.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It is an entirely new proposition?

Mr. CAMPBELL. That is a new proposition which has never been referred to a committee of this House and appears for the first time in this rule.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Has it as a bill ever been introduced?

Mr. CAMPBELL. A bill for that purpose has never been introduced, as I understand it. The matter was brought before

the Committee on Rules by Members of the House, who asked that it be made in order on the Post Office appropriation bill by this rule.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. But it was not a part of the Post Office bill?

Mr. CAMPBELL. No.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Now, may I ask the gentleman if this is his understanding of that provision—that the New York Herald, a large paper; the Philadelphia North American—

Mr. CAMPBELL. Or the Chicago Tribune.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Or the Detroit Free Press, or any other newspaper of the country having a large circulation, would be obliged under the provision of this rule, brought in in this hurried way, to publish conspicuously every day the names of its proprietors, its editors, and of all its stockholders having stock valued above \$500 in order to obtain the use of the mails?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And that in violation of that provision it would be forbidden the use of the mails?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes; that is the proposition this part of the rule will make in order to the Post Office appropriation bill; and I will say to the gentleman—

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And those papers throughout the United States owned by corporations not publishing the names of all their stockholders holding more than \$500 worth of stock would be forbidden the use of the mails utterly under this provision?

Mr. CAMPBELL. That is the language of the provision; and I will state to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the proposition was proposed by one of the leading newspaper men of this House, a Member of Congress who is a newspaper man, and knows something of the influences that are back of some of the newspapers of this country—

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. May I trespass upon the gentleman long enough to say—

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. CAMPBELL. I would like to have some of my own time to discuss some other matters of this rule; and I can not yield but to one gentleman at a time in an orderly way.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. We are getting to a very interesting point, and I think it would be well worth while having a little more light on the subject.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I was given 10 minutes. Have I consumed 10 minutes?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Yes; the gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. Speaker, I now yield five minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state that the Chair was mistaken; the gentleman from Kansas has two minutes remaining.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I will yield the two minutes back to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, as I have taken my seat and cooled off. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair was looking at another gentleman's figures rather than those of the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the rule of the House that prohibits legislation on an appropriation bill is perhaps a wise one ordinarily, but, in my opinion, this House yielded more of its power and more of its dignity as a part of the legislative branch of this Government when it made that rule than on any other occasion. The truth is when a thing ought to be done it ought to be done now, and the way it ought to be done is the best way and the quickest way you can do it. Now, everybody knows that the legislation proposed by this rule—and when I refer to the rule I refer primarily to resolution 444, which I introduced by direction of the committee—is legislation pertaining to the Post Office Department of the utmost value to this country. It could not be enacted except as a rider upon the Post Office appropriation bill, for the very reason that a dozen separate bills covering all of these 12 questions here presented could not possibly be gotten through this House with the other business which is before it, and if they did they would find their graveyard at the other end of the Capitol; but when placed as a rider upon this bill, not only the House is forced to respond but the Senate must respond to each and all of these propositions. Therefore, the wisdom of legislation along these lines. Who is it in this House who opposes the protection of the railway mail clerks of the United States by forcing the con-

struction of steel cars for that purpose? Who is it who is not willing to check the collusion between contractors and officials of the Government, and who is it that is not willing to see competition in mail pay? Who is it that is willing longer for a gag law depriving the officials of the department of the right of free speech? Who is it who opposes the eight-hour laws and compensatory pay for overtime? Who is it who is not willing to have a just reclassification of the clerks? Who is it who does not want to respond in some measure to the demand of the people for a parcel post? Who is it who does not want to see this Government extricate itself, if possible from the position it is in with reference to the postal savings bank, a proposition that has already added several hundred and will add over 20,000 officials to the Government, one that is not paying the Government, but one with which you must deal to-day by provisions that will enable this department to make it efficient if it be possible to do so, and it can not be done except by this measure? Who is it who opposes this measure? Let the gentlemen who are opposed to these post-office provisions, essential and necessary for the protection of this Government, vote against this rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. Just one minute. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Would it not have been possible for the Post Office Committee to have brought in a bill on any of these important subjects at any time?

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. Of course it would; and one-half of them would have been killed. That is the reason we put them on here as riders. We are going to make you respond to these questions that some want to dodge. [Applause.]

I have no time to discuss these measures, but I do want to say that the parcel-post proposition has been considered thoroughly by this committee. We know this Government can not go into a general parcel post now without an immense addition of perhaps 40,000 officials and immense loss. Therefore we have recommended a commission for the general consideration of the proposition, and the experiment will cost nothing, because of the rural post. And I will ask that this parcel-post proposition, except the one proposed by the committee, be voted down, in order that this House may act intelligently and know the facts we ought to know before we enter upon this legislation finally; that we may know what is just and best for all.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY].

[Mr. LANGLEY addressed the House. See Appendix.]

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS].

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Speaker, the proposition that because a thing has been done in a certain way for a long period of time, we should therefore continue to do it in that way, for all time to come is not one that appeals to me very strongly. The overthrow of Cannonism was due to dissatisfaction with the old way of doing things. One outcome of our protest against the established order of stand-pat-ism, is the present Democratic House. The whole system of rules is a purely artificial creation designed to enable a legislative body to do business. When a change in these rules, is necessary to enable this body to do public business more efficiently, that change should be effected, whether it comes about through a rule from the Rules Committee, or not. The test should be, whether it is in aid of the public business. The fact that it is an innovation need arouse no antagonism. If riders to the pending, or any other bill are required to enable the House to meet public expectations in respect of needed legislation, then riders should be utilized, and the required legislation thereby afforded. All of us know the condition of legislation in this body. We also know the difficulty of securing consideration for ordinary legislation at the other end of this Capitol, and we further know with respect to the legislation that is embodied in this report of the Committee on Rules, that if we wish effective action on this legislation it is necessary to attach it to the pending bill, as we have the right to do. In due and orderly course, by adopting this rule.

Talk about rules! The system of rules that formerly prevailed in this House muzzled, and shackled the Members. This rule gives to this body, which is above all its committees, the opportunity to deal with questions of transcendent importance which are agitating the country to-day from one end of it to the other—the parcel post, steel cars for the railway mail clerks, and national

aid to roads in the States. If it is not possible to secure adequate consideration of these matters, other than by a rule, and it is not, then the rule is the proper parliamentary agency for us to employ. Some gentlemen in arguing the proposition of national aid to roads, as embodied in the rule have insisted that the proposed legislation would interfere with or trench upon the functions of the States. To a bill to this effect I would be unalterably opposed. I would favor no measure that would disturb, or derange these functions, but the gentlemen who make this criticism of the proposed measure, are simply unacquainted with its terms. One participant in this debate asserted that the road bill was a form of centralization. Not at all. The proposition as to national aid to roads which is found in the report from the Committee on Rules, and which is made in order that it may be considered by this House, has no sort of relation to centralization, and in no wise interferes with local and domestic affairs in the States.

One element of merit in the particular proposition relating to roads is that we have eliminated from it every feature of national control over local concerns, or domestic highways. All that the rule under consideration proposes to do with relation to this, and the other propositions embodied therein, is to give this supreme legislative body an opportunity to deal with them fairly and squarely. Who challenges the propriety of this action, or questions that such a course is at once safe and sound? It is the policy of meeting an issue, in lieu of shirking, or evading it.

Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Virginia yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. SAUNDERS. I do.

Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio. Do I understand that the adoption of this rule will permit the consideration of the Lloyd bill, eliminating the gag rule?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Certainly.

I ask the gentlemen in opposition to take issue on the merits of this proposition. Announce to the country at large, if you will, that you are opposed to the policy of allowing this body to deal effectively with the questions carried in this rule. Say to the country, if you will, that the Democratic attitude of freedom of opportunity is wrong, and that when the Committee on Rules seeks to aid us to arrive at the consideration of these great questions, to which its rule relates, its aid should be rejected. Avow frankly that you are opposed to any opportunity of consideration being afforded preferring to go on, in what you call the old way, a way which consisted in submerging propositions of national interests, and keeping them from legislative contemplation. This is what Cannonism did, and on this account Cannonism was rejected by the country. This rule, Mr. Speaker, merely makes in order a number of germane propositions of great importance, and gives to this body the opportunity to consider them. If that be treason, I say, make the most of it. [Applause.]

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN].

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Speaker, the majority of this House has not proposed new legislation, so far, that has met with my approval. But I do want to be fair enough to say that the present Post Office appropriation bill reflects credit on the majority of this House. [Applause.]

I shall vote, as long as I am in this House, for any proposition that I believe is for the general interests of the people, regardless of its authorship. I am going to vote for this rule, and I also intend to vote for the appropriation bill—the Post Office appropriation bill. I feel proud of the fact that the chairman of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads is a colleague of mine, and represents an adjoining district in Tennessee, and I hope he will be returned here as long as he desires. [Applause.]

I believe in the protection of the postal employees and in the earliest possible substitution of all-steel cars for wooden cars for the protection of their lives. I believe in a definite and fixed 8-hour day for post-office clerks and city carriers, and also an increase of pay for the rural carriers. I favor a reclassification of the railway postal clerks.

I have made two campaigns—successful campaigns—and advocated in each of those campaigns national aid for public roads, and I intend to stand on that proposition in this House.

I am opposed to what has been denominated the “gag law” or civil-service rule that prevents a Government employee from appealing to his Representative in Congress to look after any grievance that the employee may have with the department with which he is connected.

There are a number of other very just and wise provisions in this bill, and I regret that the limited time yielded to me will

not permit me to go more fully into them. But I regret exceedingly that the Republican Party in the Sixty-first Congress did not pass the bills which you intend to include in this Post Office appropriation bill by this special rule, and I hope my Republican colleagues on this side of the House will prove to the country that the Democratic Party shall not have all of the credit for this legislation, for it is in the interests of the people, and should become a law at the earliest possible time, and no technicality or rule of this House should stand in the way. It affects the interest of every class of our constituencies, and it ought to appeal to every Member of this House, regardless of which side of the Chamber he sits upon. [Applause.]

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART] is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of this rule. I am in favor of it for the 23 varieties of reasons to which my friend from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] called attention awhile ago; but I am especially in favor of it because, in addition to being a Member of this House, I hope I still represent the great and glorious profession of journalism in this country. [Applause.] When I went before the Committee on Rules yesterday I gathered up from the desks in this House 10 of the greatest newspaper publications of this country. Two of them carried the names of the editors; 1 of them carried the name of the publisher. The other 7 were circulated by the thousands and hundreds of thousands as anonymous publications. Nobody who reads them only knows the authorship or inspiration of those publications and their editorials. If the amendment in this rule prevails and this provision becomes a law, the country will know who controls or directs editorial opinions of the day. It will bring the honest editor out from under the unfair suspicion that he is controlled by evil influences.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman accept the amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURNESON], if he offers it, that the names of the bondholders shall also be published?

Mr. BARNHART. I certainly will. I want to make the act as broad and effective as possible. We have heard it said, and we have accepted the sweet philosophy for years, that the hand that rocks the cradle is the hand that rules the world; and I believe that the hand that writes the editorials is the hand that guides the world. And we ought to have that hand as clean and righteous as it is possible to make it.

For these and many other reasons I hope the rule will be adopted. [Applause.]

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] to use some of his time.

Mr. DALZELL. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, this is the most remarkable rule, filled with curiosities as it is, that has come before this House during my service of now a little more than 15 years in the House.

I do not understand how the Committee on Rules managed to escape including in this rule some other propositions that are pending before the House. Why, for instance, does the Committee on Rules include a proposition to take possession of the express companies practically at once, a proposition which has not been reported by any committee of this House, and fail to include in the rule a proposition to make in order the consideration of the substance of the bill already reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, regulating the rates which express companies may charge? Upon what theory has the Committee on Rules proceeded to pay no attention to the bills which have been considered by committees of the House, charged with consideration of the subject matter, and reported a rule to make in order a proposition which has not been considered by any committee of the House, unless it be the Committee on Rules, which knows nothing about the matter, and if it did has given no consideration to the subject?

Why does the committee, in reporting the rule, make in order the Shackelford bill and not make in order the Underwood resolution? Why did the Committee on Rules turn down the majority leader of the House in the resolution which he introduced concerning the study of the subject of highways, and the relation of the public funds thereto, and report the Shackelford resolution, which had never been considered by the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, which has this subject under consideration, and propose to consider only the bill reported by the Committee on Agriculture?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. MANN. I do not yield.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I wanted to answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman can not anticipate the question.

Mr. CAMPBELL. But the gentleman asked a question.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman can not answer the question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois declines to yield.

Mr. MANN. No one can give a reason for it. There is no reason for it. This is blind groping in the dark by men without eyes.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The Underwood resolution has already been favorably reported by the Committee on Rules.

Mr. MANN. But it is not in order; is not a privileged bill; can not be offered as an amendment to this bill. The gentleman's committee proposes to make in order as an amendment on the Post Office appropriation bill another bill standing on an equal footing in the House. Why did they not make the Underwood bill in order as an amendment on the Post Office bill? The gentleman's answer shows that he, at least, on the committee knew nothing about the subject. [Applause.]

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Will the gentleman allow me to correct him?

Mr. MANN. In his own time, which I did not restrict. The gentleman from Texas has reported a resolution involving almost everything under the sun, and perhaps some things beyond our sun in other skies, and himself declined to yield to questions, alleging that he did not have the time, although he had made the motion which shut off the time.

It is the first time I ever have seen in this House a proposition involving so much where the gentleman in charge refused to explain, refused to answer questions, declined to yield, because he did not have the time which he himself had restricted.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I took the floor in the main for the purpose of saying that if we have to vote on this rule as a whole, I shall vote against it. I have no criticism of those who desire to vote for the proposition in the bill. I believe it is always within the power and the right of the majority of a legislative body to enact legislation which it favors, and, having that right, they have the right to bring in a rule providing that it shall be in order on a bill to take it up by itself and providing for its consideration in any manner. I do not criticize that. My criticism is directed against reporting a proposition into the House involving important matters, concerning which no one in the House knows anything, and concerning which there has been no consideration before the country, before the House, or before the committees of the House. It is my purpose, when the debate shall be closed, to demand a separate vote on the various propositions involved in this resolution, and unless the Speaker, which I do not think he will do, shall propose that he is a greater czar and more defiant of the House than Czar CANNON in his day, we will have a separate vote on the substantive propositions in the rule.

I shall ask for a separate vote on the parcel-post proposition in the bill, which, if I can not obtain anything better, I shall vote for. I hope if it is made in order it will be made of more value than the provisions in the bill, but I shall vote against the propositions which are not in the original Post Office bill if I can have a separate vote on this rule as to the different propositions.

Mr. Speaker, there are times when I have the highest respect for this body as a whole and for its individual Members. But there are times when I can see more cowards in the House of Representatives in the same number of men than can be found in an equal number anywhere else in this country. [Applause.]

I prefer when I go out of public life to be turned out because I have had the moral courage to vote according to my own convictions, rather than to be chasing to know the popular sentiment of this proposition to-day, guessing what it shall be tomorrow, and hoping that my turn may go with the turn of the wind. If this House votes according to its own sentiment, according to what it believes, according to what it knows, according to its real judgment, it will not go far astray upon any of these propositions, but if it votes out of cowardly fear it loses its own self-respect. It may retain its membership, but it will not be as well off as if it had lost a large portion of it. [Applause.]

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD].

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I shall not vote for this rule. It contemplates the consideration on the Post Office appropriation bill of certain legislative provisions. They may be generally divided into two classes: One, a class of provisions that have been considered by the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, the committee which, under the rules of the House, has jurisdiction of the provisions in the bill and which it has reported for the consideration of the House; and the other, certain provisions which have not been reported from that committee. One of the latter provisions, contemplating legislation of the most comprehensive and important character, has not been reported from any committee, and one which, although

reported from a committee, has received slight if any consideration whatever.

I am not opposed as a universal thing to legislation on appropriation bills, but I believe there is a clear line of demarcation that should be observed in order to obtain beneficial results. Legislation that is designed to remedy legislative abuses or to advance the interests of good administration may properly and wisely be included in these bills. But legislation that proposes to initiate new and untried and poorly considered schemes of governmental activity, in my judgment, unwisely are placed in these bills. My recollection is that back early in the seventies it was a Republican Congress that enacted the Federal supervisors' election law as a part of an appropriation bill.

I have no desire to provoke retaliation from that side of the House when eventually the Republicans come into power by the adoption of such rules as will permit a repetition of such legislation. I do not believe it wise to attempt to legislate on these matters in this way. I am heartily in favor of most of the provisions reported by the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads and incorporated by the committee in this bill. I should welcome an opportunity to support such provisions. But if the price to be paid to obtain the consideration of them is to support a rule which permits consideration of these other two provisions—one for the condemnation of the express companies and the other for the initiation of a policy of giving Federal aid to State and local roads—then I shall not support the rule. The disadvantages that will follow far outweigh the benefits to accrue from the provisions which I favor.

The adoption of this good-roads policy would end any hope that the Democratic Party may have to make a record for economy in this session. According to the reports, as I have been able to gather them, the least that will be taken under this provision, if it be adopted, is \$15,000,000 a year, and it may run up to thirty or forty millions a year. No one who favors aid from the Federal Government for State roads will pretend for a moment that the payment of \$30 per annum per mile for the upkeep for macadamized roads would be of any advantage whatever in the maintenance of such roads. I do not believe the Federal Government should enter upon that policy. I am unwilling to have considered this so-called compromise scheme, which was hurriedly put together by the advocates of some 38 different propositions, if I recall correctly, and overnight reported by the committee which was supposed to be giving deliberate, careful consideration to legislation of this character.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I only have five minutes, and I have no time to yield.

Mr. SAUNDERS. But the gentleman is making statements with respect to this bill and its preparation and consideration about which he is absolutely in error.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Virginia will pardon me. That question can be discussed by the gentleman in his own time. I decline to yield further. I am entitled to make my own statement, and my statement is based upon the reports contained in the press of this city, which are usually pretty accurate in detailing such matters.

Mr. SAUNDERS. But here is—

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I decline to yield further. Members, like myself, a great many, the vast majority of the House, are busily engaged in committee work. Since the 4th day of December, the Christmas holidays, with the exception of five days, I have been engaged every day in considering estimates submitted by the various departments. They necessitate the investigation of every conceivable governmental question. Such work occupies all of my time. It is important, difficult work, and can not be shirked or neglected. Therefore, I must rely, as many others must rely, very largely for information upon the reports of committees upon important legislation not originating in the committee of which I am a member. I am unable to be in the position that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] says Members should occupy, namely, prepared at any moment to consider these important matters. I think it is unfair to Members of the House to inject in this way legislation of such character for their consideration. It is not my desire nor the desire of others who believe as I do to obstruct or prevent legislation, but we desire honestly to consider legislation properly, and should not be put in the position where it is impossible to do so.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, this House of Representatives adopted a code of rules agreed to in caucus. One of those rules prohibits general legislation upon appropriation bills. For

over two generations general legislation, especially of a non-administrative character, has been substantially prohibited upon general appropriation bills. And why? Under the Constitution the money must be appropriated from the Treasury in order that the public service may be carried on. It has been found if you place a condition upon the voting of money from the Treasury certain legislation that one body may not approve or that the other body may not approve, which is ordinarily crude and ill digested, is not good legislation. Therefore the rule.

I quite agree with what the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] said, that at times matters of administration are by unanimous consent proper to be placed upon appropriation bills, and sometimes by special rule. I think it would have been entirely apt and proper that the paragraph in the Post Office appropriation bill touching parcel post should have been covered and made in order for consideration by a special rule. That is a matter which has been considered by the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. But what does this resolution propose to do? How many Members desire to consider as a rider of the Post Office appropriation bill the question of ownership of railways by the Government—

A MEMBER. Express companies.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, railways.

Mr. MANN. That would be an amendment in order.

Mr. CANNON. Probably an amendment in order, and there are people who believe if you take over express companies under this power as proposed, that it would lead to Government ownership. How many of you touching that matter like that proposition? How many of you like one of a half dozen propositions here? And yet the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] and gentlemen on this side of the House who are going to vote for this rule say that those who are opposed to it are opposed to the parcel post—are against the will of the people—anathema maranatha. Why, gentlemen in their enthusiasm will not be offended if I say this is pure, rank demagoguery. Now, I am perfectly willing to vote for a special rule to consider every proposition that was reported from the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, including parcel post, increase of salaries, and so forth; but, says the gentleman, all times are proper, and this is the place to give righteous legislation. Look here. Why did not you make it in order by this rule on this other bill to change the law touching conspiracy? Why did not you, in making and reporting this rule, make it in order to amend this bill to try contempt cases by jury? Your last national platform declares for such legislation.

Mr. BARTLETT. Or repeal the oleomargarine bill?

Mr. CANNON. Oh, yes; and 40 other things. Why did not you report this rule and let this House, the greatest legislative body on earth, acting for 90,000,000 people, put on all of the good legislation, especially that which you pledged in your national platform, upon an appropriation bill to make sure that the Government will starve unless the Senate agrees to the bill? Why did not you do it? I will tell you why, because you are sweating great drops of blood, figuratively speaking, for fear you will have to vote on some of these questions. What answer are you going to make to Samuel Gompers—

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. CANNON. Well, the gentleman did not yield.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I do not believe the gentleman from Illinois asked me to yield.

Mr. CANNON. Why, certainly; if the gentleman will yield me enough time to answer one question.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I will do that. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman speaks of a rule in case of indirect contempt and injunction. Mr. Speaker, I desire to say to him that the Judiciary Committee has authorized a report on these bills, and he will have an opportunity surely of voting on them before this session is at an end. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. CANNON. Why did not you put it on an appropriation bill [applause on the Republican side], this appropriation bill where the gentleman says the Government shall not go on unless the Senate agrees to your legislation?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. We intend to put it on the statutes.

Mr. CANNON. I have answered the gentleman's question—oh, put it on the statutes. Suppose the Senate will not have it?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Then the people will defeat the balance of them.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, the gentleman is not candid—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I would like a minute more to conclude.

Mr. DALZELL. I yield the gentleman two minutes more.

Mr. LANGLEY. The gentleman from Texas owes him a minute.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I yield to the gentleman one minute. Mr. CANNON. That makes three minutes. [Laughter and applause.] Now, unless this rule is voted upon and amended, the gentleman, my colleague from Illinois, having given notice that he would ask a separate vote upon every substantive proposition, I will vote against the rule. I will vote for the consideration of many of the propositions in the rule, especially that which pertains to the postal service, but I will not go beyond that.

Oh, let the people rule [laughter], said the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENZHOFF]. He would vote to report anything from the Committee on Rules for which the majority of the members would sign a petition. Why, every member of the Illinois Legislature—and I have no doubt it would be possible here where we sign petitions pro forma—every member of the Illinois Legislature some years ago signed a petition that the governor should be hanged and drawn and quartered. [Laughter.] You get petitions from Members of this House, and you find people who are asked to sign, do sign all the petitions substantially. Let the House act here, not upon petitions of Members of the House of Representatives, but let it act officially. So much for that. I wish and I hope I may get a little time in the event this rule is adopted to address the House further, and if perchance the rule should not be adopted I hope that the opportunity will be given to perfect this Post Office appropriation bill, which we have before us, touching the postal service. [Applause.]

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] wish to use any more of his time?

Mr. DALZELL. Do I understand the gentleman has only one speech now?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Only one speech in conclusion.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to discuss the merits of the various legislative propositions in this rule. I wish to discuss simply the methods by which these propositions are sought to be enacted, and I venture to say, without fear of contradiction, that no such proposition has ever before been presented by a Committee on Rules to any House.

What is this proposition? The rules of the House prescribe that no general legislation shall be permissible upon a general appropriation bill. This proposition is that we shall make in order 12 substantive legislative provisions that are reported in the Post Office appropriation bill and that, under the rules of the House, are not in order. It proposes, in addition to that, that we shall make in order for consideration by the House at this time a bill which comes from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, a bill over which the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads has no jurisdiction, a bill which the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has had under consideration for some considerable time, but up to this time has not found itself prepared to report. It proposes that we shall make in order on this Post Office appropriation bill a bill that comes from the Committee on Agriculture, over which the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads has no jurisdiction. It proposes we shall make in order on this Post Office appropriation bill an amendment not sent to any committee, not originating with any committee, but originating with individual Members of this House and formulated for the first time in a hearing before the Committee on Rules.

It seems to me, gentlemen, that without much argument it is clear that if we indulge in this method of legislation we might as well abolish entirely this particular rule of the House with respect to general legislation on appropriation bills.

Now, what is it that the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads proposes to have made legitimate by this rule? The new legislation that they propose is as follows:

They provide for new equipment of railway postal cars.

For the prevention of combinations among bidders for postal contracts.

For bonding in the naval-postal service.

For a readjustment of compensation in certain cases after weighing.

For an extension of the eight-hour law.

For the amendment of civil-service rules, and the legalizing of labor unions in the postal service.

For the grading and compensation of railway postal clerks by the Postmaster General.

For a limited parcel post and the appointment of a commission to report on a general parcel post.

For a change in the compensation of rural letter carriers.

For free delivery in villages.

For the establishment, maintenance, and extension of postal savings depositories.

For the designation of naval clerks in the Marine Corps.

Each and every one of these is a substantive proposition, which is prohibited by the rules from being in a general appropriation bill. As legislation they are entitled to a separate report by that committee, to separate consideration by this House, to separate consideration by the Senate, and separate consideration by the President. It is in violation of the rules of the House that these measures are now to be put up to the House to be voted upon, under the penalty that if they are not, the appropriations to carry on the business of the Government shall fail.

Now, it is said that this is the only opportunity that we will have to vote upon these measures. If that be so, then the responsibility rests with the majority of this House. The Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads was appointed on the first day of the first session of this Congress, more than a year ago. It has never reported any of these substantive propositions. Nothing prevents it reporting each and every one of them in a separate bill within 24 hours of this time, and nothing prevents their consideration under the regular rules of the House. But if consideration under the regular rules of the House should prevent such consideration, the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads has a good case to appeal to the Committee on Rules for a rule for their consideration.

Now, then, what more does this rule propose by way of setting aside the rules of the House? It proposes that on a post-office appropriation bill you shall consider a bill to regulate commerce with foreign countries and between the States and to increase the facilities and the efficiency of the postal service, a bill that, as I have said, has been before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee for a long time and upon which testimony has been taken, about which that committee has not yet made up its mind, about which it has not reported, and which will involve, if adopted, an expenditure upon the part of this Government of some \$34,000,000 to \$40,000,000. You are asked to consider that out of its order by virtue of a rule in connection with legislation on a general appropriation bill from the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

And that is not all. It is proposed that on this general appropriation bill you shall consider a resolution which went to the Committee on Agriculture and which means the opening wedge toward the initiation of Federal legislation for the building of good roads in this country. That is a measure that deserves separate consideration. That is a measure that deserves to go to the Senate for its approval, unaffected by any danger of cutting off an appropriation. That is a matter that the President of the United States has the right to consider, when he comes to sign or refuse to sign the bill, unembarrassed by any consideration relating to an appropriation.

And that is not all. We are asked to consider under this rule in connection with the general appropriation bill from the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads a provision which makes it incumbent upon the editors and managers and owners of every newspaper, periodical, and magazine in this country to spread upon their front pages the names of substantially all the parties connected therewith. That has not gone to any committee, has never been considered by any committee, and has never been urged, save by individual Members appearing before the Committee on Rules at a private hearing.

Now, without taking up the time of the House further, what I protest against is the inauguration of legislation by any such method as this. Why, this Chamber has rung, year in and year out, with denunciations of the Committee on Rules for compelling the House to consider measures arbitrarily at the instance of the Committee on Rules, fixing the method by which those measures should be considered; and yet in all the history of all the Congresses no Committee on Rules ever undertook to introduce and ask favor for a resolution of such a character as this. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK].

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] charges the Committee on Rules and the House of Representatives with cowardice because of the presentation of this special rule. If I had to draw the indictment, it seems to me the charge would be different. I am not sure but that I would put it "foolhardy courage." No man on earth can justly say that the party or the committee which proposes to throw open to all amendments questions upon which the people of every congressional district in the United States are so much divided can justly be charged with cowardice or

unwillingness to face issues. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The proposition upon which the greatest assault has been made in connection with this rule is the proposition to give Federal aid to the post roads of this country. The statement was made by a distinguished gentleman on this side of the Chamber that that proposition had not received consideration from any committee of this House. Upon authority of numbers of gentlemen who are members of the committee that did consider it, I wish to state to that gentleman, as well as to the House, that for weeks this matter received intelligent and careful consideration by the Committee on Agriculture, by whom it was reported with scarcely a dissenting vote, if any, on either side of the Chamber.

Not only that, but, gentlemen of the House, your Committee on Rules was confronted by a petition signed by 225 Members of this body asking that the House of Representatives be allowed to vote on this proposition in connection with the Post Office appropriation bill, to which it is germane.

Gentlemen may scout the idea that the Committee on Rules should pay any attention to the wishes of the majority of this House. Ah, they have scouted that idea in the past. I remember another occasion, not many years ago, when the control of this House was in different hands, when the Committee on Rules did deny to nine-tenths of its membership a proper and legitimate petition.

But the American people repudiated such leadership, and they sent us here to-day because they believed the Democratic Party at least would pay attention to what the majority of the Members want, and would give effect to what the majority of the people of this country demand. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

There are things in this rule that no gentleman will oppose. We propose to make in order, by this rule, provisions for better and safer cars for the railway mail clerks of the country. What gentleman will oppose it?

We propose to make in order—and it could not be in order but for the adoption of this rule—protection of civil-service employees from unjust discharge for political or personal reasons. What gentleman on either side of this Chamber will oppose it?

We propose to make in order an equitable and fair regrading of the railway mail clerks of this country. What Member, Democrat or Republican, dares oppose it?

We propose to prevent combination among bidders who are seeking to furnish the Post Office Department with supplies, so that the Government may be saved from extortion and robbery. What gentleman on either side of this House opposes it?

Mr. BARTLETT. If that be true, as doubtless it is, was a rule necessary in order to have these propositions put upon the bill?

Mr. HARDWICK. A point of order might be insisted upon, and my colleague knows full well that if insisted upon it would be good.

Mr. BARTLETT. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman that these propositions ought to go on the bill.

Mr. HARDWICK. Those propositions ought to stay in, and this rule was the only way in which we could secure absolute safety on each one of those propositions.

We have also proposed to open up to the widest extent the parcel-post question, so that the Representatives of the American people may voice their convictions upon this floor, and so that the majority of the people of America shall have what the majority of the elected Representatives of the people declare they desire. Is that cowardice? Is that dodging? Is that shunning the question? Is that avoiding the issue?

The gentleman criticizes us for sending in here, to be voted on in connection with this parcel-post question, what is called the parcel-express question. Yet no gentleman will deny that there can be no intelligent consideration of the parcel-post question as a whole unless the Goeke bill be considered and settled.

Gentlemen insist that this rule is drastic; that it goes too far. Gentlemen of the House of Representatives, my reply is that the rule does nothing except let the House consider and vote upon each one of these questions and do whatever each Member thinks is right with each one of these questions.

Now, gentlemen, we have heard a good deal to-day about the details of this rule. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] asked why we did not include the proposition of my colleague [Mr. ADAMSON] to regulate express rates. We did not do that simply because it was not germane to the question as to whether we shall have a parcel-post system or not.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDWICK. I will if my colleague will make it short.

Mr. MANN. It is germane to the question of taking possession of and purchasing the express companies.

Mr. HARDWICK. Not at all; because if we are to purchase them and operate them as a parcel-post system there will be no necessity whatever to regulate the rates they charge, because the Government will run the system and fix the rates by law.

Mr. MANN. No; but it is germane to have the right to vote on the alternative proposition, which you decline to give.

Mr. HARDWICK. We are to vote on the parcel post, and not on the regulation of express rates.

Now, what else? The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] raised the point that we ought to have considered the Underwood resolution, simply providing for a commission to investigate the good-roads question. My answer to him is twofold: First, we felt bound to report what is known as the Shackelford proposition, because 225 Members of this House insisted that it was their desire to have a vote upon that question, and no demand whatever was made on the committee to report, in connection with this bill, the Underwood proposition. We do not submit the Underwood proposition in connection with the Shackelford proposition, because if the House of Representatives is to adopt the Shackelford proposition at all, there is no need to have a commission at all, because we will go much further than that at the first step. If the proposition should be beaten, the Committee on Rules have already reported favorably the Underwood resolution, and we can get a separate vote on the Underwood proposition afterwards.

Now, gentleman, a great deal of objection is raised to this rule, because they say it involves legislation in connection with an appropriation bill.

Let me say now what I said when this Congress was first organized, that it is my deliberate judgment that in 1837, when a coalition of Whigs and Independents forced this House, the Democrats being in the minority, to pass this rule which provided against legislation in connection with appropriation bills, they absolutely destroyed to a large extent the power, importance, and influence of the House of Representatives in comparison with other branches of our Government. The power over the purse, the power to deny appropriations unless legislation is granted, has always been the great power of the commons in every parliamentary body on this earth.

It was the power that forced right and justice from the English kings. It was the power that in the Constituent Assembly that secured the liberty and rights of Frenchmen. And to-day, my friends, it is the one thing that is needed to restore the American House of Representatives to that power, that influence, that dignity, that importance to which it is so justly entitled and of which it has been deprived by its cowardly surrender of its rights in 1837 and failure to resume them since. [Applause.]

So far as the Democratic Party is concerned, we are willing to trust the people. So far as the Democratic Party is concerned, we believe that the Representatives who come fresh from the people every two years, who are accountable at frequent periods to the people who send them here, who have a practical recall constantly staring them in the face, can be trusted to protect the popular rights and to promote the interests of all the people. I believe that anything that enhances the power of the popular branch of Congress, anything which tends to increase its dignity and its importance, is a long step forward in the march of popular government.

So we present this rule, confident that the people of America will understand that so long as the Democratic Party is in control of this House, in this historic Chamber, the House of Representatives is going to assert itself; that we are going to legislate whenever the people demand it, and legislate in connection with appropriation bills; that the House in reclaiming to some extent its ancient prerogatives is taking a long step forward in the fight for popular government. [Applause.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask a division of the question on the substantive propositions.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman's request is not in order.

Mr. MANN. Upon that I desire to be heard.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. And I desire also to be heard on it.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like to inquire of the gentleman from Illinois exactly what his proposition is.

Mr. MANN. I demand a separate vote on various substantive propositions in the resolution. I refer to the printed report. I ask for a separate vote on the proposition on page 3, under the heading of section 8, providing for a rural parcel post, and under the same section, toward the top of page 4, providing for a commission; and also a separate vote on the three propositions, following the language at the bottom of page 4, one a condemnation of express companies, one the roads proposition, at

the top of page 7, and the other the Barnhart proposition, at the end of page 7.

As to the others I have no desire for a separate vote, as far as I am concerned.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Chair understands that I make a point of order that the request is not in order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair so understood and the Chair will hear the gentlemen.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, paragraph 6 of Rule XVI reads as follows:

On the demand of any Member before the question is put, the question shall be divided if it includes propositions so distinct in substance that if one be taken away a substantive proposition shall remain.

And the question is whether after the previous question has been ordered on the report from the Committee on Rules, or a resolution providing that certain things shall be in order, the substantive propositions in that resolution shall be separated and voted upon separately.

The matter is not without precedents in the House. The Speaker will remember that at the first session of the Sixtieth Congress the Democratic side of the House, under the able leadership of Mr. WILLIAMS, of Mississippi, was conducting an open and avowed filibuster.

The Committee on Rules, on April 8, 1908, page 4505 of the RECORD, reported this rule as a privileged report, the report being made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL]:

Resolved, That on this day and on Thursday of this week the House shall take a recess at 5 o'clock p. m. until 11:30 a. m. of the next calendar day; that on Friday, April 10, at 11:30 a. m., the Speaker shall declare the House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 20471, the naval appropriation bill; that at 5 o'clock p. m. on Friday, April 10, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union shall declare the committee in recess until 11:30 a. m. on Saturday, April 11; that at 5 o'clock p. m. Saturday, April 11, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union shall declare the committee in recess until 11:30 o'clock a. m. on Monday, April 13.

That general debate on the naval appropriation bill shall close not later than at 5 o'clock p. m., Saturday, April 11; the time to be equally divided between the majority and minority and controlled by the chairman of the Naval Committee and by the senior member of the minority: *Provided*, That if general debate shall be concluded prior to 5 p. m. on Saturday the 11th, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole shall at once declare the committee in recess until Monday, April 13, at 11:30 a. m.

On that report the gentleman from Pennsylvania demanded the previous question. The previous question was ordered. Twenty minutes' debate was had upon a side, precisely as has been the case in the present instance, with the exception that here the debate, by unanimous consent, has been a little longer, and the Speaker will notice that that entire resolution which I have just read related to the same general subject matter, namely, the meeting of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union on the consideration of the naval appropriation bill. When debate had concluded under the twenty-minutes-a-side rule, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD], the most distinguished parliamentarian upon that side of the House, if not in the country, rose and said:

Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division of the resolution.

And he called attention to the rule which I have just read. He was asked by the Speaker to state the different substantive propositions, which he proceeded to do. The gentleman from Pennsylvania made this statement:

The resolution is nothing more nor less than a program of legislative proceeding, and it is absolutely impossible to make any distinction and take away a part of it.

But the Speaker, Mr. CANNON, who has at different times in the country, by different people, been accused of being a czar and of not giving the minority that fair treatment which they sometimes insisted they should have—and I think I have heard the gentleman from Texas make such remarks—said:

The Chair is prepared to rule. On a careful examination of this rule the Chair finds that there are five substantive propositions, and five only, so that if the gentleman demands a separate vote upon either or all of them a separate vote will be taken.

And a separate vote was taken.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the matter here is embraced in one substantive legislative proposition, and that is, Shall this resolution containing certain things, with one resolving clause, be adopted by the House? I freely concede that if there were several resolving clauses in the resolution, then the precedents are overwhelming that a division could be demanded upon each one of them. Let me call the attention of the Chair to this language in the notes to the Rules of the House of Representatives, at page 384 of the Digest, Sixty-second Congress, second session:

It is not in order to demand a division of a related subject, as, when a resolution to adopt a series of rules not made a part of the resolution was before the House, it was held not in order to demand a sepa-

rate vote on each rule. In voting on the engrossment or passage of a bill or joint resolution a separate vote on the various portions may not be demanded or on the preamble of a bill.

If the Chair will permit me, I desire now to call attention to this precedent, which is found in volume 5 of Hinds' Precedents, on page 599:

On December 2, 1901, the question was on agreeing to the following resolutions:

"Resolved, That the rules of the House of Representatives of the Fifty-sixth Congress be adopted as the rules of the House of Representatives of the Fifty-seventh Congress, with the following modifications:

"1. That the special orders adopted March 8 and March 14, 1900, providing a method for the consideration of pension bills, claim bills, and other private bills, shall be continued during the Fifty-seventh Congress.

"2. That the place of the Select Committee on the Twelfth Census in the rules of the Fifty-sixth Congress shall be filled in the rules of the Fifty-seventh Congress by a standing committee on the census, to consist of 13 members, and have jurisdiction of all proposed legislation concerning the census and the apportionment of Representatives.

"Resolved further, That there shall be appointed to serve during the Fifty-seventh Congress a select committee on industrial arts and exhibitions, to consist of nine members, which shall have jurisdiction of all matters (excepting those relating to the revenue and appropriations) referring to the centennial of the Louisiana purchase and to proposed exhibitions."

Mr. CLAUDE A. SWANSON, of Virginia, demanded a division of the question.

Mr. JOHN DALZELL, of Pennsylvania, urged that the first resolution with its modifications was not divisible.

The Speaker [Mr. David B. Henderson] said:

"The first branch of the resolution, as just recited by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, is not capable of division; the Chair so holds; but the Chair is of opinion that each resolve is a separate proposition, and a separate vote may be demanded upon it."

So, Mr. Speaker, in this proposed rule there is a single, simple proposition containing these matters with one resolving clause, that this resolution be adopted.

Therefore, if by a single resolution we could adopt the rules of the House, containing at that time 45 separate and distinct rules with a half dozen different modifications, and they were not subject to division upon the demand by a Member, for a much stronger reason there is nothing in this resolution that is susceptible of division. Now, let me go a little further. If there is anything in precedents, this one is directly in point. I quote from Hinds' Precedents, volume 5, page 600:

On a resolution for the adoption of a series of rules which were not presented as a part of the resolution, it was held not in order to demand a separate vote on each rule.

On December 2, 1901, at the time of the organization of the House, the question was on agreeing to the following resolution:

"Resolved, That the rules of the House of Representatives of the Fifty-sixth Congress be adopted as the rules of the Fifty-seventh Congress," and so forth.

Mr. CLAUDE A. SWANSON, of Virginia, said:

"The resolution contains the proposition that we adopt all the rules of the last House, and therefore each rule is made a part of it."

So he demanded a vote on each rule.

The Speaker said:

"The Chair is clearly of the opinion that such a demand can not be entertained."

So there is another precedent, Mr. Speaker, directly in point. But, aside from these precedents, let us apply the rule of common sense. When you bring in a simple resolution as this embracing a number of propositions it should not be subject to division, otherwise when you bring in a bill under any such circumstances, by the same parity of reasoning, the gentleman from Illinois might demand a division of every section and line and sentence of such bill. Here is a plain proposition that gentlemen can decide whether they will adopt this resolution embracing all of these things or not. This is one substantive legislative proposition, and that is whether this resolution shall be adopted or not, and it is submitted to the House for that purpose alone.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas first claimed that a division of this question is not in order, because on the final passage of a bill or resolution a division is not in order. No one on this side, I think, is so simple-minded as to suppose that you can divide a bill into different parts on the final passage of the bill on a roll call. The gentleman then says that the proposition we now make is not applicable because it can only be applied when there are various resolving clauses in the resolution, and that if there were different resolving clauses in the resolution, then each of those resolving clauses would have a separate vote. First, Mr. Speaker, in the case which I have cited to you where the rule was made by Mr. Speaker CANNON there was but one resolving clause; and second, if the gentleman from Texas were familiar with the provisions of the Revised Statutes which are applicable to this subject he would know that a resolution which has more than one resolving clause was out of order, because the statutes adopted by this House and Senate jointly provided:

No enacting or resolving words shall be used in any section of any act or resolution of Congress except in the first.

The gentleman's proposition seems to be now that you can not have a separate vote upon anything unless in the preparation

of it you have violated the statutes. Now, Mr. Speaker, the case which the gentleman stated does not bear out his contention. In the resolution which was offered referred to by the gentleman there was a proposition to adopt the rules of the previous Congress as the rules of the Fifty-sixth Congress. Mr. Speaker Henderson then held that the different propositions in that resolution were separable, and that one could have a separate vote upon each proposition involved, but he held, and held properly, that a resolution to adopt the rules of a previous Congress by itself was not subject to be considered as containing different substantive propositions and did not authorize a separate vote upon each of the rules of the previous Congress. No one seriously ever claimed that a proposition in this Congress to adopt the rules of previous Congresses would authorize a separate vote upon each rule, but when there was coupled with that proposition another resolution expressly providing another rule, the Speaker held that they were subject to separation, because each was a substantive proposition. I hope and I believe that the present Speaker of this House will without question on this subject follow the ruling of Mr. Speaker CANNON, made in fairness at a time when the House was under great stress of feeling and excitement on the request of the gentleman from New York, at that time representing the Democratic side of the House, in his request. Then the Speaker divided into substantive propositions a resolution wholly relating to the question of meeting and adjournment. There is the resolution, the different parts of which have no relation whatever to each other. I contend that the House is entitled, in voting, to vote upon the separate propositions, and is not compelled to carry out any bargain which may have been made by the supporters of the different propositions, of "you tickle me and I will tickle you," all at one time. [Applause.]

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. Speaker, I understood the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] to say in discussing this proposition that it never was seriously insisted that a proposition to adopt a set of rules as a whole did involve a number of substantive propositions. On the contrary, if I heard the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] read aright, that contention was seriously made in this body during both the Fifty-sixth and Fifty-seventh Congresses by the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. SWANSON.

Mr. MANN. I said no one now would seriously contend that.

Mr. HARDWICK. In the face of that ruling?

Mr. MANN. In the face of any ruling.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. And the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] resisted that argument and took the position I have now taken.

Mr. HARDWICK. It is refinement of reason, too fine for any ordinary man to follow, for the gentleman to say, when a proposition is brought into this House to adopt a set of 41 rules, every one of which is different, that that proposition does not substantially and on its merits involve a number of separate and distinct propositions, just as there are a number of separate and distinct rules of the House of Representatives.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDWICK. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. If a resolution were presented setting out each of the rules in 41 different places, does the gentleman doubt that would be subject to division?

Mr. HARDWICK. Not a bit in the world, nor do I doubt the other would.

Mr. MANN. How could you adopt a simple resolution to adopt a set of rules adopted by a previous Congress?

Mr. HARDWICK. If the gentleman will allow me to answer the question, I can answer it. It does not matter whether you put it in one form or another. We are seeking matters of substance in questions of this kind, and if the motion is to adopt 43 separate and distinct rules there are 43 separate and distinct propositions involved in them, I do not care how many resolving clauses there are in them.

Now, it seems to me if the House of Representatives can adopt 43 rules on the first day of Congress as one substantive proposition, certainly, if we apply the principles of common sense to this proposition and not get into technical refinements like the gentleman wants to do, we could adopt 4 rules on the second day of the session or to-day as one substantive proposition. For the merits of the question are not different because we are approaching the end of the Congress instead of being at its beginning. Has common sense been altered because we are on April 18 of this year instead of April 4 of last year? If we could adopt 43 rules at the one time as one substantive proposition, it seems to me it is a matter of common sense that we can to-day adopt 4 rules as one substantive proposition. The gentleman referred to the decision made by Mr. Speaker CANNON. I agree that this decision is authority for the view he presents, but it is the

only authority that he can lay his hand upon in all the realm of parliamentary law. It is without precedent and without parallel. Against that ruling we submit the ruling of Speaker Henderson on two separate occasions, of very much more importance than that to which the gentleman refers, when Democrats, standing on this side of the Chamber, were arguing exactly on the opposite side of the question. We say the precedents are two to one against the argument now urged by the gentleman from Illinois. And that was an order to adopt and fix a special rule coming from the Committee on Rules has special rights and privileges and is entirely different from what the situation would be if we were in the Committee of the Whole or in the House considering legislation. Common sense is on our side of this question; the precedents, by a majority of two to one, are on our side of the question; and we think the point of order made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] ought to be sustained.

Mr. MANN. In the case the gentleman cites did the Speaker, as a matter of fact, hold it was subject to division—the short decision by Speaker Henderson? The gentleman knows the resolution was never held by Speaker Henderson to be subject to a separate vote.

Mr. HARDWICK. No; I did not so understand it.

Mr. MANN. I thought the gentleman did not.

Mr. HARDWICK. Does the gentleman dispute the contention that Speaker Henderson twice held that a motion, no matter how it was framed, to adopt the rules of a preceding Congress, even if there were some 40 rules involved, was one question and indivisible? It does not matter at all, to my mind, whether there is one or two or three resolving clauses. It is a matter of substance, not a matter of technicality, that I am addressing my argument to.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman will permit me—

Mr. HARDWICK. Yes—

Mr. MANN. This resolution was offered:

Resolved, That the rules of the House of Representatives of the Fifty-sixth Congress be adopted as the rules of the House of Representatives of the Fifty-seventh Congress.

Speaker Henderson held that that was not subject to division.

Mr. HARDWICK. That is exactly what I thought, and what I stated to the Speaker.

Mr. MANN. Speaker Henderson, however, held that a resolution to the same effect further on—

Resolved, That there be appointed, to serve during the Fifty-seventh Congress, a special Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions—

And so forth, all offered at the same time, was subject to division or a separate vote.

Mr. HARDWICK. I can see the reason for that. It is a different question.

Mr. MANN. Speaker Henderson said, "What will you divide?"

Mr. HARDWICK. The substantive propositions?

Mr. MANN. There was only one substantive proposition.

Mr. HARDWICK. There is only one substantive proposition here, and that is to adopt this rule. [Applause.]

Mr. MANN. The gentleman himself knows that they have added or collected up a variety of different propositions from different committees, all substantive propositions.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call to the attention of the Chair the phraseology of the rule. The rule begins with the declaration that certain legislation shall be in order, beginning with the resolving clause. If the Chair will turn, then, to the bottom of page 4, the Chair will see that a new and distinct proposition is then made, beginning with these words:

It shall also be in order, notwithstanding the general rules of the House, to consider in connection with said H. R. 21279—

That is, this bill—the following—

Repeating substantially the language that is contained in the first paragraph of the rule; and it makes two propositions quite as clear as if at the bottom of page 4 there had been another "resolved" put into the rule; and if the Chair has any question concerning the matter of the absence of the word "resolved" affecting the question, I call the attention of the Chair to volume 5 of Hinds' Precedents, where it was held that merely formal words, such as "resolved," may be supplied by interpretation of the Chair.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it does not seem that there can be any question but that if this rule, up to the bottom of page 4, be voted out there is a substantive proposition remaining, or if the balance of 1, 2, 3, or 4 be voted out there are still substantive propositions remaining.

The SPEAKER. There are not very many precedents on this subject, one way or the other.

The two precedents cited from Speaker Henderson are really parts and parcels of one precedent. A division was demanded in a resolution. His first decision was that there should be a separate vote taken on each resolve. When that was through with, somebody undertook to divide the first resolve, and he held that could not be done.

The most elaborate precedent in the lot, and the last one, is that on page 4509, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, first session of the Sixtieth Congress. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] reported a rule from the Committee on Rules. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] demanded a division, claiming that there were seven substantive propositions in the rule. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] took identically the same position then that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] takes to-day, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] took precisely the same position then that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] takes to-day. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] was himself mixed up in that debate. He seems to have agreed with the gentleman from New York on the proposition that a division could be had, but he differed from the gentleman from New York as to how many substantive propositions there were involved.

Mr. Speaker CANNON, after listening to the debate, decided that the division could be had.

So it seems to the Chair that the precedents are in favor of the contention of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] and against the point of order of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY].

In addition to that, it seems to the Chair that the reason of the thing is the same way. There are several substantive legislative propositions embraced in this rule that have no connection whatever with one another. A Member might, and most probably would, be in favor of some and against others. He has a right to vote his sentiments on each, which he can not do if they are bunched together. Therefore the point of order raised by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] is overruled, and the Clerk will report the first proposition. [Applause.]

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HARDWICK. How many separate questions are involved, according to the ruling of the Chair—three or four?

The SPEAKER. The Chair is not going to pass on that, because the Chair thinks it is unnecessary. The first proposition on which a separate vote is demanded is on page 3, section 8.

Mr. MANN. Including the first four lines on page 4.

The SPEAKER. Including the first four lines at the top of page 4, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of that part be dispensed with, as it has been read, and I think we all understand it. We can vote on it as the Speaker has designated it.

Mr. CARLIN. I object.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I desire to call attention to the fact that the vote should be taken on that portion down to section 8, on page 3, before the vote is taken on section 8.

The SPEAKER. The question is first on agreeing to that part of the resolution extending down to section 8, on page 3.

The question being taken, the designated portion of the resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first part, on which a separate vote is demanded. Does the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] ask unanimous consent to waive the reading?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I believe I will withdraw the request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman withdraws the request. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 8. That hereafter postage shall be paid on matter of the fourth class at the rate of 12 cents per pound, except as herein provided.

That no article, package, or parcel shall be mailable as matter of the fourth class which exceeds 11 pounds in weight, except as herein provided.

That on each and all rural mail-delivery routes of the United States the postmaster at the starting point of such route shall, until June 30, 1914, receive and deliver to the carrier or carriers of said routes all articles, parcels, or packages not prohibited by the mails by law and falling under the definition of fourth-class matter and not weighing in excess of 11 pounds for transportation and delivery on said routes only; and the carriers shall receive at intermediate points on all rural routes such mail matter of the fourth class for delivery on their respective routes only.

That postage shall be paid on all articles, parcels, or packages entitled to transportation under the provisions of this act as matter of the fourth class on rural-mail delivery routes only at the following rates: One cent for each 2 ounces or less, 2 cents for more than 2 ounces but not more than 4 ounces, 3 cents for more than 4 ounces but not more than 8 ounces, 4 cents for more than 8 ounces but not more than 12 ounces, 5 cents for more than 12 ounces but not more than a pound, and 2 cents per pound for each additional pound or fraction thereof up

to and including a total of 11 pounds. That the Postmaster General shall make all rules and regulations necessary and not inconsistent with law to the proper execution of this act.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Before this matter comes to a vote I desire to ask whether this is the proper time to offer an amendment.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. The gentleman can not move to amend it. The previous question has been ordered.

The SPEAKER. The previous question has been ordered. The question is on adopting that part of the resolution which has been read.

Mr. MANN. I ask for a division, Mr. Speaker.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 237, noes 0.

Accordingly the designated portion of the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the balance of what is called section 8, providing for a general parcel-post commission.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

That for the purpose of a full and complete inquiry and investigation into the feasibility and propriety of the establishment of a general parcel-post commission of six persons, three of whom shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and three by the President of the Senate, is constituted, with full power to appoint clerks, stenographers, and experts to assist them in this work. They shall review the testimony already taken on the subject of parcel post by Senate and House committees and take such other testimony as they deem desirable. For the purpose of defraying the expenses of this commission the sum of \$25,000 is hereby appropriated out of the moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to that part of section 8. Those in favor of adopting as a part of the resolution the paragraph just read will say "aye."

Mr. MANN. I ask for a division, Mr. Speaker.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 201, noes 6.

Accordingly the designated portion of the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. MANN. I have no objection to taking a vote upon what is designated as sections 9 to 12, inclusive, on page 4.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to that part of the resolution from 9 to 12, both inclusive.

The designated portion of the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. MANN. I ask for a separate vote on the express condemnation provision, which, unless some one else desires a further separate vote, would include from the word "first," at the bottom of page 4, down to the bottom of page 6.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I ask unanimous consent that the reading be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. That is not necessary. It has already been read, and the only way anyone can get it read again is to request it and then have unanimous consent for it.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I understood the Speaker to direct the Clerk to read.

The SPEAKER. The Chair did, but that was by inadvertence.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. That was the reason I made the request.

The portion of the resolution referred to is as follows:

First. In connection with section 8 of the bill the following:

"That in order to promote the postal service and more efficiently regulate commerce between the several States, the Territories of the United States, the District of Columbia, the possessions of the United States, and foreign nations the contracts and agreements and arrangements of the several express companies with the several railroad companies or other common carriers of the United States, its Territories, and the District of Columbia relating to the collecting, receiving, caring for, storing, dispatching, forwarding, and delivering by such railroad company or other common carriers of parcels, packets, and packages, and other express matter, as well as the franchises, operating equipment, cars, vehicles, horses, buildings, leases, as lessees, of buildings used in the conduct of the express business, and all other property or rights and privileges owned and used by such express companies as necessary and appropriate to such collecting, receiving, caring for, storing, dispatching, forwarding, and delivering of such parcels, packets, packages, and express matter, are hereby declared to be, and the same are hereby, condemned and appropriated to and for the United States of America, to be used by it for such public purposes as may be proper in its various functions. That the words "express company" as used in this act shall be construed to include any corporation, joint-stock company, association, partnership, and individual, as far as engaged in the collecting, receiving, caring for, storing, dispatching, forwarding, and delivering of parcels, packets, packages, and other express matter, by rail or water. And the words "railroad" or "railway company" shall be construed to include any transportation agency by rail or water as far as used as a post route or in carrying express matter. On and after July 1, 1913, any railroad, steamship, or other transportation agency having a contract with any express company subject to this act shall transport and carry for the Post Office Department all matter transportable under said contract, and shall execute and perform with respect to such Post Office Department all such duties as have been customary under such contract in relation to the express company or companies named therein, and shall permit its agents and employees when required to continue to discharge such services in respect thereto, and upon like terms, without interference on its part.

"DUTY OF PRESIDENT AND POSTMASTER GENERAL.

"Sec. 2. That it shall be the duty of the President on the 1st day of July, 1913, to take charge and possession of all the property of such express companies condemned and appropriated by this act, in the name of and by the authority of the United States of America; and thereupon it shall be the duty of the Postmaster General to employ said property and facilities in conjunction with the postal service, and to henceforth conduct said express service.

"POWERS OF POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT.

"Sec. 3. That it shall be the duty of the Postmaster General to make and promulgate such rules and regulations for carrying into effect the provisions of this act as he may deem necessary, not in conflict with the Constitution or laws of the United States; *Provided*, That all such rules and regulations shall be subject to review and revision by the Interstate Commerce Commission and the courts in like manner and with like effect as if said rules and regulations had been made and promulgated by a railway company or other common carrier.

"COMPENSATION FOR RAILROAD TRANSPORTATION.

"Sec. 4. That during the months of August and December, 1912, and April, 1913, the weights of matter carried over the respective railroads, under contracts with the express companies during the pendency thereof, shall be taken for each railroad company in respect to such contract, under regulations to be provided by the Post Office Department; and the amount of money paid for the carriage thereof to the railroad shall be divided by the mileage of such railroad over which such matter is carried; and thereafter the Postmaster General shall, if the railroad company consent thereto, cause to be paid to such railroad company the amount per mile owing to such railroad under such contract as thus computed; and thereafter annually at such times as may be determined upon by the Postmaster General such matter shall be weighed, and the railroad company shall be paid monthly for the excess weight carried by it, over the first weighing herein provided, such sums as may be agreed upon for such excess weight; but if such Postmaster General and such railroad company shall fail to agree upon a basis of compensation for such excess weights, then the same shall be paid for according to the terms and provisions of the contract condemned in such case.

"RENEWAL OF TRANSPORTATION CONTRACTS.

"Sec. 5. That at the expiration or termination of any contract between an express company and a railroad condemned by this act (or at any time before, if such railroad company shall consent thereto) the Postmaster General may contract with such railroad company for the transportation of postal express matter; and if deemed advantageous, upon cars provided by the postal department, which may be transferred without unloading onto the lines of other railroad companies, at such rates of compensation and upon such principles of computation thereof as may be agreed upon, with the right of review and revision of the same by the Interstate Commerce Commission as hereinafter provided. And in case the Postmaster General and such railroad company, after the expiration or termination of the contract with an express company, shall fail to agree upon the terms and provisions of the renewal thereof, they shall submit their respective contentions with reference thereto to the said Interstate Commerce Commission, which shall thereupon have plenary power to declare the terms and provisions which said contract shall contain; but from any determination with respect to any such contract the terms and provisions of which have been so declared by the said Interstate Commerce Commission an appeal shall lie to the Court of Commerce, which shall enjoy like power to amend and revise the same.

"APPRAISEMENT OF EXPRESS COMPANIES.

"Sec. 6. That immediately after the passage of this act it shall be the duty of the Interstate Commerce Commission to appraise the value of the property condemned and appropriated by the United States of America in section 1 of this act and award to the respective express companies just compensation therefor. Each commissioner shall take oath to justly perform such duties before some judge of the courts of the United States. The said Interstate Commerce Commission shall have power, and it shall be its duty, to summon witnesses, with books and papers, before it, for either of the parties, and require such witnesses to testify, and it shall give to each party a full hearing; and it shall be the duty of such commission, on or before the 1st day of May, 1913, to file a separate award of appraisement for each express company condemned under this act, with respect to the property condemned, and give notice of the filing of such award to the Postmaster General and to such express company. And if either party shall be dissatisfied with the amount of said award, the same may, upon appeal by either party, be reviewed and revised by the Court of Commerce, sitting as a court of review, with respect thereto; and from its determination a further appeal may be taken by either of the parties to the Supreme Court of the United States.

"PROVISIONS FOR COMPENSATION OF EXPRESS COMPANIES.

"Sec. 7. That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to make payment to such express companies of the money adjudged to be due them, as aforesaid, out of the Treasury of the United States, and said express companies shall be entitled to payment of such final award as compensation from the Treasury of the United States and the Treasurer thereof, and the amounts of said award are hereby appropriated to the parties entitled thereto out of the Treasury of the United States.

"DUTIES OF COMMON CARRIERS.

"Sec. 8. That any willful failure or refusal by any railroad company or other common carrier, subject to the provisions of this act, to perform any service required by this act or by any lawful rule or regulation made and promulgated by the Postmaster General in pursuance of this act, or of any lawful ruling, finding, or determination of the Interstate Commerce Commission, or of any order, judgment, or decree of any court of the United States of competent jurisdiction shall constitute a misdemeanor, which, upon indictment and conviction, shall be punished by a fine not exceeding \$1,000.

"POWERS OF POSTMASTER GENERAL.

"Sec. 9. That the Postmaster General shall have power to rent, lease, or purchase real estate and personal property, supplies, cars, and equipment for use by his department for the purposes of this act. He shall have power to condemn in the name of the United States any property, real, personal, or mixed, which he may deem necessary for the efficient operation of the service, but the said Interstate Commerce Commission shall first value and file its award therefor as hereinbefore specified."

The SPEAKER. Those in favor of adopting this part of the resolution, beginning with "first," near the bottom of page 4, down to the bottom of page 6, the express-company provision, will say aye, those opposed no.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Division, Mr. Speaker.

The House divided; and there were 104 ayes and 89 noes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. LEWIS rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. LEWIS. For the purpose of understanding the status of the motion. Is the House voting on the question as to whether the Goeke bill may be considered?

The SPEAKER. The House is voting on the question whether the designated part of the resolution concerning the express companies shall continue a part of it.

Mr. LEWIS. I wondered whether the House understood the proposition that it was voting upon.

The SPEAKER. The House is not adopting these propositions as a part of any law. It is simply voting as to whether certain things shall be made in order on the appropriation bill which otherwise would not be in order.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 178, nays 99, answered "present" 8, not voting 106, as follows:

YEAS—178.

Adair	Driscoll, D. A.	Kinkaid, Nebr.	Pray
Aiken, S. C.	Dupré	Kinkaid, N. J.	Prince
Akin, N. Y.	Edwards	Kitchin	Raker
Alexander	Esch	Knowland	Rauch
Allen	Evans	Konop	Rees
Anderson, Ohio	Faison	Lafayette	Reilly
Ansberry	Farr	La Follette	Riordan
Anthony	Fergusson	Lee, Pa.	Ruby
Ashbrook	Ferris	Lever	Rucker, Mo.
Austin	Foster	Lewis	Russell
Barnhart	Fowler	Lindbergh	Saunders
Bathrick	Francis	Linthicum	Scully
Boehne	French	Littlepage	Shackelford
Booher	Fuller	Lloyd	Sherwood
Borland	Gallagher	Loud	Sisson
Bowman	Gardner, N. J.	McGuire, Okla.	Sloan
Broussard	George	McKellar	Small
Brown	Graham	McKenzie	Smith, J. M. C.
Buchanan	Gray	McKinney	Smith, Saml. W.
Bulkeley	Hamilton, Mich.	McLaughlin	Smith, N. Y.
Burke, Wis.	Hamlin	Maguire, Nebr.	Smith, Tex.
Byrnes, S. C.	Hammond	Maher	Stedman
Byrnes, Tenn.	Hardwick	Martin, Colo.	Steenerson
Campbell	Hardy	Miller	Stephens, Cal.
Candler	Harrison, Miss.	Morgan	Stephens, Miss.
Cantrill	Harrison, N. Y.	Morse, Wis.	Stephens, Nebr.
Cary	Hartman	Mott	Stephens, Tex.
Cline	Haugen	Murdock	Stone
Collier	Hayden	Murray	Taggart
Conry	Helm	Neeley	Talcott, N. Y.
Crago	Henry, Tex.	Nelson	Taylor, Colo.
Cravens	Higgins	Norris	Tribble
Cullop	Howard	Nye	Underhill
Curry	Howland	Oldfield	Volstead
Daugherty	Hughes, Ga.	O'Shaunessy	Warburton
Davenport	Hughes, N. J.	Padgett	Watkins
Davis, Minn.	Hull	Parran	Webb
De Forest	Humphreys, Miss.	Patton, Pa.	Wedemeyer
Denver	Jacoway	Pepper	White
Dickinson	Johnson, Ky.	Peters	Wickliffe
Difenderfer	Johnson, S. C.	Plumley	Wilson, Pa.
Dixon, Ind.	Kendall	Porter	Witherspoon
Dodds	Kent	Pou	Young, Kans.
Donohoe	Kindred	Powers	
Doremus			

NAYS—99.

Anderson, Minn.	Davis, W. Va.	Jones	Roberts, Mass.
Andrus	Dent	Kopp	Roddenberry
Ayres	Dies	Korbly	Rothermel
Barchfeld	Draper	Langley	Rouse
Bartholdt	Dyer	Lee, Ga.	Sharp
Bartlett	Ellerbe	Lenroot	Sherley
Beall, Tex.	Finley	Littleton	Slayden
Bell, Ga.	Fitzgerald	Longworth	Speer
Blackmon	Flood, Va.	McKinley	Sulloway
Brantley	Flood, Ark.	McMorran	Sulzer
Browning	Foss	Macon	Sweet
Burke, S. Dak.	Garner	Malby	Thistlewood
Burleson	Gillett	Mann	Towner
Burnett	Glass	Martin, S. Dak.	Townsend
Butler	Godwin, N. C.	Mondell	Turnbull
Calder	Good	Moore, Pa.	Tuttle
Cannon	Green, Iowa	Morrison	Underwood
Carlin	Gregg, Pa.	Needham	Whitacre
Catlin	Gregg, Tex.	Palmer	Wilder
Claypool	Harris	Payne	Willis
Cooper	Hay	Pickett	Wilson, N. Y.
Crumpacker	Hayes	Post	Wood, N. J.
Currier	Holland	Prouty	Young, Mich.
Dalzell	Hubbard	Redfield	Young, Tex.
Danforth	Humphrey, Wash.	Richardson	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—8.

Burgess	Davidson	Hobson	Sims
Covington	Gould	McCreary	Stevens, Minn.

NOT VOTING—106.

Adamson	Berger	Carter	Copley
Ainey	Bradley	Clark, Fla.	Cox, Ind.
Ames	Burke, Pa.	Clayton	Cox, Ohio
Bates	Callaway	Connell	Curley

Dickson, Miss.	Heflin	McDermott	Sells
Doughton	Helgesen	McGillcuddy	Sheppard
Driscoll, M. E.	Henry, Conn.	McHenry	Simmons
Dwight	Hensley	Madden	Slemp
Estopinal	Hill	Matthews	Smith, Cal.
Fairchild	Hinds	Mays	Sparkman
Fields	Houston	Moon, Pa.	Stack
Fordney	Howell	Moon, Tenn.	Stanley
Fornes	Hughes, W. Va.	Moore, Tex.	Sterling
Gardner, Mass.	Jackson	Moss, Ind.	Switzer
Garrett	James	Olmsted	Talbott, Md.
Goeke	Kahn	Page	Taylor, Ala.
Goldfogle	Kennedy	Patten, N. Y.	Taylor, Ohio
Goodwin, Ark.	Konig	Pujo	Thayer
Greene, Mass.	Lamb	Rainey	Thomas
Griest	Langham	Randell, Tex.	Tilson
Gudger	Lawrence	Ransdell, La.	Utter
Guernsey	Legare	Reyburn	Vreeland
Hamill	Levy	Roberts, Nev.	Weeks
Hamilton, W. Va.	Lindsay	Robinson	Wilson, Ill.
Hanna	Lobeck	Rodenberg	Woods, Iowa
Hawley	McCall	Rucker, Colo.	
Heald	McCoy	Sabath	

So the designated portion of the rule was agreed to.

The following additional pairs were announced:

Until further notice:

Mr. GOLDFOGLE with Mr. TILSON.

Mr. McDERMOTT with Mr. WOODS of Iowa.

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas with Mr. Copley.

Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland with Mr. SIMMONS.

Mr. CARTER with Mr. KAHN.

Mr. PUJO with Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL.

Mr. GARRETT with Mr. WILSON of Illinois.

Mr. PAGE with Mr. OLMSTED.

Mr. GOEKE with Mr. AINEY.

Mr. LAMB with Mr. McCREARY.

Mr. CLARK of Florida with Mr. LANGHAM.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee with Mr. STERLING.

Mr. THAYER with Mr. SLEMP.

On this vote:

Mr. GRIEST (for) with Mr. McCoy (against).

The result of the vote was then announced, as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The next vote will be upon agreeing to the next substantive proposition contained on page 7 of the report, known as the good-roads proposition.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FITZGERALD) there were—ayes 151, noes 57.

So the proposition was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The next vote will be taken upon agreeing to the next substantive proposition to be found near the bottom of page 7 of the report, respecting the publication of the ownership of newspapers, popularly known as the Barnhart proposition.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I join in that demand for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 230, nays 34, answered "present" 5, not voting 122, as follows:

YEAS—230.

Adair	Cooper	Garner	Konop
Aiken, S. C.	Covington	George	Kopp
Akin, N. Y.	Cravens	Godwin, N. C.	Korbly
Alexander	Cullop	Goodwin, Ark.	Lafayette
Allen	Currier	Graham	Lafferty
Anderson, Minn.	Curry	Gray	La Follette
Anderson, Ohio	Dalzell	Green, Iowa	Langley
Ansberry	Danforth	Gregg, Pa.	Lee, Ga.
Anthony	Daugherty	Hamlin	Lee, Pa.
Ashbrook	Davenport	Hammond	Lenroot
Austin	Davis, Minn.	Hardwick	Lever
Ayres	Dent	Hardy	Lindbergh
Barchfeld	Denver	Harrison, Miss.	Linthicum
Barnhart	Dickinson	Harrison, N. Y.	Littlepage
Bathrick	Dies	Hartman	Lloyd
Beall, Tex.	Difenderfer	Haugen	Loud
Bell, Ga.	Dixon, Ind.	Hay	McGuire, Okla.
Berger	Dodds	Hayden	McKellar
Blackmon	Doremus	Hayes	McKenzie
Boehne	Driscoll, D. A.	Helm	McKinley
Booher	Dupré	Henry, Tex.	McKinney
Borland	Dyer	Higgins	McLaughlin
Bowman	Edwards	Holland	Macon
Brown	Ellerbe	Howard	Maguire, Nebr.
Browning	Faison	Howland	Maher
Buchanan	Farr	Hughes, Ga.	Malby
Burke, Wis.	Fergusson	Hughes, N. J.	Martin, Colo.
Burnett	Ferris	Hull	Martin, S. Dak.
Butler	Finley	Humphrey, Wash.	Moon, Tenn.
Byrnes, S. C.	Flood, Va.	Humphreys, Miss.	Morgan
Byrnes, Tenn.	Floyd, Ark.	Jacoway	Morrison
Campbell	Focht	Johnson, Ky.	Morse, Wis.
Candler	Foss	Jones	Mott
Cantrill	Foster	Kendall	Murdock
Carlin	Fowler	Kent	Murray
Cary	Francis	Kindred	Needham
Cline	French	Kinkaid, Nebr.	Neeley
Collier	Fuller	Kinkaid, N. J.	Nelson
Conry	Gallagher	Kitchin	Norris
		Knowland	Nye

Oldfield	Rauch	Sloan	Tribble
O'Shaunessy	Rees	Small	Turnbull
Padgett	Reilly	Smith, J. M. C.	Underhill
Page	Richardson	Smith, Saml. W.	Underwood
Palmer	Riordan	Smith, N. Y.	Volstead
Parran	Roberts, Mass.	Smith, Tex.	Warburton
Patterson, Pa.	Roddenberry	Stedman	Watkins
Pepper	Rothermel	Steenerson	Webb
Peters	Rubey	Stephens, Cal.	Wedemeyer
Pickett	Rucker, Mo.	Stephens, Miss.	White
Plumley	Russell	Stephens, Nebr.	Wickliffe
Porter	Saunders	Stephens, Tex.	Willis
Post	Scully	Stone	Wilson, Pa.
Pou	Shackelford	Sulloway	Witherspoon
Powers	Sherley	Sulzer	Young, Kans.
Pray	Sherwood	Sweet	Young, Tex.
Prince	Sims	Taylor, Colo.	
Raker	Sisson	Towner	

NAYS—34.

Andrus	Donohoe	Longworth	Speer
Bartlett	Draper	McMorran	Tilson
Brantley	Evans	Mann	Townsend
Burke, S. Dak.	Fitzgerald	Miller	Tuttle
Calder	Gardner, N. J.	Mondell	Wilder
Cannon	Gillett	Moore, Pa.	Wilson, N. Y.
Catlin	Good	Payne	Young, Mich.
Claypool	Harris	Redfield	
Crago	Hubbard	Rouse	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—5.

Burgess	Hobson	McCreary	Stevens, Minn.
Glass			

NOT VOTING—122.

Adamson	Gardner, Mass.	Lamb	Rucker, Colo.
Ainey	Garrett	Langham	Sabath
Ames	Goetze	Lawrence	Sells
Bartholdt	Goldfogle	Legare	Sharp
Bates	Gould	Levy	Sheppard
Bradley	Greene, Mass.	Lewis	Simmons
Broussard	Gregg, Tex.	Lindsay	Slayden
Burke, Pa.	Griest	Littleton	Slemp
Burleson	Gudger	Lobeck	Smith, Cal.
Callaway	Guernsey	McCall	Sparkman
Carter	Hamill	McCoy	Stack
Clark, Fla.	Hamilton, Mich.	McDermott	Stanley
Clayton	Hamilton, W. Va.	McGillcuddy	Sterling
Connell	Hanna	McHenry	Switzer
Copley	Hawley	Madden	Targart
Cox, Ind.	Heald	Matthews	Talbot, Md.
Cox, Ohio	Heiln	Mays	Talcott, N. Y.
Crumpacker	Helgesen	Moore, Pa.	Taylor, Ala.
Curley	Henry, Conn.	Moore, Tex.	Taylor, Ohio
Davidson	Hensley	Moss, Ind.	Thayer
Davis, W. Va.	Hill	Olmsted	Thistlewood
De Forest	Hinds	Patten, N. Y.	Thomas
Dickson, Miss.	Houston	Prouty	Utter
Doughton	Howell	Pujo	Vreeland
Driscoll, M. E.	Hughes, W. Va.	Rainey	Weeks
Dwight	Jackson	Randell, Tex.	Whitacre
Estepinal	James	Ransdell, La.	Wilson, Ill.
Fairchild	Johnson, S. C.	Reyburn	Wood, N. J.
Fields	Kahn	Roberts, Nev.	Woods, Iowa
Fordney	Kennedy	Robinson	
Fornes	Konig	Rodenberg	

So the proposition was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. PUJO with Mr. BARTHOLDT.

Mr. BURLESON with Mr. OLMSTED.

Mr. GREGG of Texas with Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

RETURN OF BILL TO THE SENATE.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the following resolution from the Senate.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary be directed to request the House of Representatives to return to the Senate the bill (S. 5333) to authorize the widening and extension of Spring Road NW., and for other purposes.

Attest:

CHAS. G. BENNETT, Secretary,
By H. M. ROSE, Assistant Secretary.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted—

To Mr. GARRETT, for 10 days, on account of official business.

To Mr. DWIGHT, for 1 week, on account of important business.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

By unanimous consent, Mr. WILSON of Illinois was granted leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of J. K. Jamison (H. R. 26081, 61st Cong.), no adverse report having been made thereon.

DIVISION OF TIME FOR GENERAL DEBATE ON POST OFFICE BILL.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time provided under the rule just adopted for general debate upon the Post Office appropriation bill (H. R. 21279) be divided between Mr. WEEKS, the ranking member on the

Republican side—or Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey in the absence of Mr. WEEKS—and myself equally.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that the time provided for in the rule just adopted for general debate on the Post Office appropriation bill be equally divided between himself on one hand and Mr. WEEKS on the other—

Mr. MANN. Mr. WEEKS is not here.

The SPEAKER (continuing). And in the absence of Mr. WEEKS Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey is to control the time on that side. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for permission to revise and extend my remarks made on this rule.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the requests? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 39 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned to meet to-morrow, Friday, April 19, 1912, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, submitting estimate of appropriation for construction of storage vault, assay office building, New York (H. Doc. No. 705); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Key West Harbor, Fla. (H. Doc. No. 706); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. WOOD of New Jersey, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred sundry bills, reported in lieu thereof the bill (H. R. 23515) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors, accompanied by a report (No. 568), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. POU, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred sundry bills, reported in lieu thereof the bill (H. R. 23451), with amendment, to pay certain employees of the Government for injuries received while in the discharge of their duties, and other claims for damages to and loss of private property, accompanied by a report (No. 569), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 7507) granting a pension to Seymour McDonough; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 23304) granting a pension to Michael Collins; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 23298) granting an increase of pension to John A. Boutte; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 23341) granting an increase of pension to Frank E. Conkling; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 23516) permitting the taxing of Indian lands in Oklahoma for public improvements; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 23517) to amend section 4488 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 299) proposing an international maritime conference; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. EVANS: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 300) to create a joint commission to investigate the use of the air for the purpose of communication and report what regulation, if any, is advisable; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. THISTLEWOOD: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 301) making appropriation for levees surrounding Cairo, Ill., and the drainage district adjacent thereto; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WOOD of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 23515) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors; to the Committee of the Whole House.

By Mr. ADAIR: A bill (H. R. 23518) granting an increase of pension to Edwin S. Palmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 23519) granting a pension to Sarah E. Duffield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 23520) granting an increase of pension to George Munday; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 23521) granting an increase of pension to Joseph C. Snider; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 23522) granting an increase of pension to Leo Long; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANTHONY: A bill (H. R. 23523) granting an increase of pension to John McKone; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 23524) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Keeran; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BATHRICK: A bill (H. R. 23525) granting an increase of pension to Minot Stebbins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FERRIS: A bill (H. R. 23526) granting an increase of pension to Caroline M. Haing; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER: A bill (H. R. 23527) granting an increase of pension to Samuel W. Walker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 23528) for the relief of Washington Miller; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HAMMOND: A bill (H. R. 23529) granting a pension to Phidella Osborn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 23530) granting an increase of pension to John Haurey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LINDBERGH: A bill (H. R. 23531) granting an increase of pension to John Lindquist; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 23532) granting an increase of pension to Francis Maddock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MCCOY (by request): A bill (H. R. 23533) for the relief of Anastasios Argyros; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 23534) for the relief of James M. Rice; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 23535) granting a pension to Isaac Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 23536) granting an increase of pension to Franklin Spurgeon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 23537) granting an increase of pension to William M. McKinley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McKINLEY: A bill (H. R. 23538) granting a pension to Raymond Tudor; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MALBY: A bill (H. R. 23539) granting a pension to Elizabeth Hogan; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NEEDHAM: A bill (H. R. 23540) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Merritt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 23541) for the relief of J. W. Goodloe; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 23542) for the relief of the heirs of Deaderick Pike, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: A bill (H. R. 23543) for the relief of Wilbur H. Lawrence, Edmond V. Lawrence, and Josephine L. Canfield; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 23544) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Monroe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 23545) granting a pension to Mary J. Mace; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PRINCE: A bill (H. R. 23546) for the relief of the heirs of Samuel G. Cabell, Joseph E. Montgomery, George E. Cook, C. Theodore Vennigerholz, and Thomas P. Leathers; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RUBEY: A bill (H. R. 23547) granting a pension to J. Frank Cornman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 23548) granting a pension to Martha E. Walker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 23549) granting an increase of pension to John Shilkett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 23550) for the relief of the heirs of Elizabeth Gardener, deceased, widow of Matthew H. Gardener, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SISSON: A bill (H. R. 23551) granting a pension to Jesse M. Dobbs; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 23552) granting an increase of pension to James Powers; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of mayors of cities in the State of New York for legislation requiring passenger vessels to be fully equipped with lifeboats and rafts; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Minnesota: Petition of M. G. Peters and 6 others, of Mantorville, Minn., against extension of parcel-post system; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of Hermann Roll and 2 other citizens, of Newark, Ohio, against the passage of interstate commerce liquor legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: Petition of Rice-Stix Dry Goods Co., of St. Louis, Mo., in favor of continuing the Tariff Board; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOWMAN: Petition of the agricultural department, Pennsylvania State College, for enactment of House bill 22871; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin: Memorial of St. Joseph Society and the Deutschen Buerger Verein, of Appleton, Wis., against the passage of all prohibition or interstate-commerce liquor laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of the Manufacturers and Merchants' League of Virginia, in opposition to the establishment of a parcel post until after the investigation and report by an impartial commission, etc.; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Cigar Makers' Local Union, No. 191, of Morris, Ill., in favor of the passage of the Reilly bill (H. R. 17253) called the free-smoker bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANNA: Petitions of citizens of Gettlinger, Haynes, and White Butte, N. Dak., asking that the duties on raw and refined sugars be reduced; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of citizens of the State of North Dakota, for enactment of House bill 14, providing for a general parcel-post system; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petitions of citizens of Garrison and Mandan, N. Dak., protesting against parcel-post legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of citizens of Wrightsonville, N. Dak., for investigation of an alleged combination existing between coal dealers; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE: Petitions of residents of Beverly, Ellensburg, Bend, Smyrna, Lowgap, Spokane, Gray, Springdale, Valley, Clarkston, Acme, and Welcome, all in the State of Washington, urging passage of Sulzer parcel-post bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petitions of members of the Improved Order of Red Men of Spokane and Colfax, Wash., urging the erection of an American Indian memorial and museum building in Washington City; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Washington and Idaho, submitted by A. D. Cross, secretary Washington State Farmers'

Cooperative and Educational Union, urging passage of parcel post and law to prohibit gambling in farm products; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petitions of citizens of Lowgap, Molson, Havillab, Loomis, Tonaskey, Oroville, and Wanicut, all in the State of Washington, urging passage of Berger old-age pension bill; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petitions of merchants of Rosalia, Thornton, Mount Hope, and Malden, all in State of Washington, protesting against a parcel-post law; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LINDSAY: Memorial of the directors of the port of Boston, concerning a proposed amendment to the interstate-commerce act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LOUD: Petition of C. F. Butford and 44 other residents of Alpena, Mich., opposing the passage of the Johnston Sunday bill (S. 237); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MCCOY: Petition of the United Garment Workers of America, Local No. 23, of Chicago, Ill., favoring immediate action upon the Booher prison labor bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Westboro, Mass., favoring passage of the Kenyon-Sheppard interstate liquor bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOTT: Petition of Frontier City Division, No. 167, Order of Railway Conductors, of Oswego, N. Y., favoring passage of House bill 20487, known as the employers' liability and workman's compensation bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the directors of the port of Boston, against a proposed amendment to section 5 of the interstate-commerce act contained in section 11 of the Panama Canal bill (H. R. 21969); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NEEDHAM: Petition of the United Presbyterian Church of Castroville and the United Presbyterian Church of Prunedale, Monterey County, Cal., favoring passage of the Kenyon-Sheppard interstate liquor bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of Geyserville (Cal.) Grange, No. 312, favoring passage of a parcel-post law; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. NYE: Memorial of Polish societies of Minneapolis, Minn., against provision in immigration bill known as the educational test; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. REYBURN: Memorial of Pennsylvania State Council, National Civic Federation, urging that an invitation be extended the International Congress of Social Insurance to meet in the city of Washington; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SCULLY: Petition of A. E. Burnside Post No. 59, of the State of New Jersey, favoring passage of House bill 14070, for the relief of veterans whose hearing is defective; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Ira B. Rice Lodge, No. 309, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, favoring passage of Senate bill 5382 and House bill 20487, known as employers' liability and workman's compensation bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALCOTT of New York: Memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, relative to operation of the Panama Canal; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Colonel J. W. Vrooman Camp, No. 51, United Spanish War Veterans, favoring passage of Crago pension bill; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama: Papers to accompany bill granting an increase of pension to James Powers; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, memorial of the Medical Society of Mobile County, Ala., for legislation to increase the efficiency of the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. THISTLEWOOD: Petition of citizens of Sparta, Ill., for building of one battleship in a Government navy yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of citizens of Cairo, Ill., for parcel-post legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of citizens of Duquoin, Ill., for appointment of a commission to investigate parcel-post systems; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petitions of citizens of the twenty-fifth congressional district of Illinois, protesting against parcel-post legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. TUTTLE: Petition of John L. Reynolds Post, No. 66, of the State of New Jersey, favoring passage of House bill 14070, for the relief of veterans whose hearing is defective; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, April 19, 1912.

The Senate met at 2 o'clock p. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord our God, who committest unto us the swift and solemn charge of life, Thou hast made us to know how frail we are. In the midst of life we are indeed in death. And the sweet and joyous earth but mocks the hearts bowed down with grief unutterable and filled with sorrow too deep for tears. Our hearts are unspeakably pained for the homes made desolate and for those who on earth are to look in one another's faces no more. We breathe a sigh and a prayer for those who have been swallowed by the mighty deep. Take them, our Father, into Thy keeping, Thou who didst create us for Thyself ere ever the earth or the sea was. May their souls rest in peace. If it be Thy holy will, restore to health and strength, we pray Thee, those who have been saved from the watery grave, and give unto them strength for the dark days to come. For those who gave their lives that these might live, we render Thee solemn thanks. Them we do not forget; their memory shall live forever.

And now, O Lord, where is our hope but in Thee, who art the God of all comfort? Though our flesh and our heart faileth, yet be Thou, O God, our strength and our portion forever. And unto Thee, who art able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think; unto Thee, who art our God and our Father, be glory on earth and in heaven now and forever more. Amen.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. GALLINGER and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented petitions of the Woman's Missionary Society of Southern Utah; of the First Baptist Church of Montgomery, Ala.; of the Latter Day Saints' Relief Society of Ephraim, Utah; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Clio, Ala.; of the Fifth Southern Methodist Episcopal Church, of Montgomery, Ala.; of members of the Salvation Army, of Montgomery, Ala.; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Mobile, Ala.; of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Spencer, Mass.; and of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Spencer, Mass., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating liquors, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of the East Washington Citizens' Association, of the District of Columbia, remonstrating against any increase being made in the salaries of officials of the District government receiving \$2,000 and over, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Common Council of Nome, Alaska, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the incorporation act for the District of Alaska, providing for a more expeditious and economical method for the collection of taxes, which was referred to the Committee on Territories.

Mr. BROWN. I present for reference a petition in the nature of resolutions signed by a large number of citizens of Nebraska, members of the medical profession, remonstrating against the passage of Senate bill 1, known as the Owen medical bill, providing for a national bureau of health. I ask that the body of the petition be printed in the Record, omitting the signatures.

There being no objection, the body of the petition was ordered to be printed in the Record, omitting the signatures, as follows:

Hon. NORRIS BROWN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We, the undersigned citizens of Nebraska, practitioners and believers in various systems of healing, including allopathic, homeopathic, osteopathic, chiropractic, Christian Science, etc., wish to enter our protest against the passage of Senate bill 1, known as the Owen bill, providing for a national bureau of health.

We consider that the older school of healing has shown, by its record of attempted legislation for more than 20 years, a desire to secure more power for its own special benefit, without advancing any reasons to show that the general public would profit thereby; they favor the Owen bill because it is in line with the legislation they have tried to secure.

We are opposed to the use of Government authority, funds, and other facilities in the interests of any particular school of healing, believing that any system which has merit can establish the same without the aid of Government authority. We claim the right to exercise our individual opinions in the selection of practitioners or systems of healing for our own use.

We believe that a national bureau of health means class legislation and is designed to deny to individuals the rights and liberties for which the citizens of these United States have contended from the beginning. Free government is measured by the liberty enjoyed by individuals, so long as those liberties do not encroach upon the rights of others, and any measures which might ever be enlarged upon or so